

Barry 195

EPS

ANN/25(2)



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
Wellcome Library

<https://archive.org/details/s25id13212520>

THE
ANNUAL REGISTER,

OR A VIEW OF THE

HISTORY

AND

POLITICS

OF THE YEAR

1856.



LONDON:

PRINTED FOR F. & J. RIVINGTON;

LONGMAN AND CO.; HAMILTON AND CO.; SIMPKIN AND CO.; RICHARDSONS;
HOULSTON AND WRIGHT; COWIE AND CO.; J. CAPES; SMITH, ELDER
AND CO.; WASHBOURNE AND CO.; H. G. BOHN; T. BUMPUS; WALLER AND
SON; J. THOMAS; L. BOOTH; A. CLEAVER; UPHAM AND BEET; BELL AND
DALDY; WILLIS AND SOTHERAN; W. HEATH; AND J. TOOVEY.

1857.

LONDON :
PRINTED BY WOODFALL AND KINDER,
ANGEL COURT, SKINNER STREET.



CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

STATE OF PUBLIC FEELING AT THE OPENING OF THE YEAR—Improved Condition of our Military Affairs—State of Trade and Commerce—Opening of Parliament—Queen's Speech—Debate on the Address in both Houses—Speeches of the Earls of Gosford and Abingdon, the Mover and Seconder—The severe Criticisms of the Earl of Derby—Reply of the Earl of Clarendon—Remarks of the Earl Granville and Lord Campbell—In the Commons, Mr. Byng moves and Mr. Baxter seconds the Address—After observations by Mr. Disraeli, Lord Palmerston, Mr. Roebuck, Sir de Lacy Evans and others, the Address is agreed to—Surrender of Kars—Debate on the Motion of Mr. Whiteside—His Speech—Reply of the Attorney-General—Speeches of Lord John Manners and the Lord Advocate—The Debate is adjourned, and continued by Mr. J. G. Phillimore, Mr. Ker Seymour, who proposes an Amendment, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir J. Pakington, Mr. Layard, Sir W. Heathcote, Serjeant Shee, and others—The Debate is again adjourned, when the principal speakers are Sir E. B. Lytton, Mr. Vernon Smith, Sir James Graham, Mr. Disraeli, Lord John Russell, and Lord Palmerston—After a Reply from Mr. Whiteside the Motion is rejected—A Pension is conferred upon General Williams by Parliament—Sir Charles Napier's defence of his conduct whilst in command of the Fleet—Reply of Sir James Graham—Remarks of Sir M. F. Berkeley, Sir C. Wood, Mr. Malins, and others 1

CHAPTER II.

THE PEACE is announced by Lord Palmerston—Debates upon it in both Houses—In the Lords the Address is moved by the Earl of Ellesmere and seconded by Lord Glenelg—Speeches of the Earls of Malmesbury, Clarendon, Derby, Aberdeen, and Grey—Remarks of Earl Granville, the Duke of Argyll, and Lord Campbell—In the Commons Mr. E. Denison moves and Mr. H. Herbert seconds the Address—A Debate ensues, in which Lord J. Manners, Mr. M. Milnes, Mr. Layard, Lord John Russell,

Lord C. Hamilton, and Sir C. Wood, take part in the first night—It is continued on the second by Mr. W. S. Lindsay, Mr. R. Phillimore, The Marquis of Granby, Mr. Sidney Herbert, Mr. Drummond, Mr. Bentinck, Mr. S. Fitzgerald, Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Whiteside, Mr. Gladstone and Lord Palmerston—The Address is agreed to—Her Majesty's Answer—Thanks to the Army and Navy are voted by both Houses—In the Lords the Motion is moved by Lord Panmure, seconded by the Earl of Derby—Observations of the Duke of Cambridge, Earls Cardigan, Granville, and Grey—In the House of Commons, Lord Palmerston is the Mover, and Mr. Disraeli the Seconder [31]

CHAPTER III.

DIFFERENCES WITH AMERICA—Motion relative to, in the House of Commons, by Mr. G. H. Moore—He is supported by Sir F. Thesiger, Mr. Baillie, and Sir John Walsh—Opposed by the Attorney-General, Mr. J. G. Phillimore, and Sir G. Grey—The debate is adjourned, and continued by Mr. M. Gibson, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Peacocke, Mr. Spooner, Mr. Gladstone, the Solicitor-General, Sir John Pakington, and Lord Palmerston—The Motion is negatived by a large majority—Mr. Layard calls attention to the state of our relations with Persia—Lord Palmerston's explanation—The affairs of Italy are discussed in both Houses—Lord Lyndhurst introduces the question in the House of Lords, and is followed by the Earl of Clarendon and the Marquises of Clanricarde and Lansdowne—Lord John Russell brings the subject before the Commons—Speeches of Lord Palmerston and Mr. Disraeli—Mr. Bowyer, Mr. M. Milnes, Mr. Whiteside, Mr. J. G. Phillimore, and Sir J. Walsh, also take part in the debate . . . [59]

CHAPTER IV.

LIFE-PEERAGES—Motion for a Committee upon, by Lord Lyndhurst—His Speech—Reply of Earl Granville—Speeches of Lord St. Leonards, the Lord Chancellor, Lord Campbell, Earls Grey and Derby, the Duke of Argyle, and Lord Brougham—The Motion is carried—Proceedings of, and various Discussions in, the Committee—Resolutions moved by Lord Lyndhurst—After a Debate, in which Earl Grey, Lord Stanhope, the Duke of Argyle, Lord Brougham, and the Lord Chancellor take part, the Resolutions are carried upon a Division—The Ministry abandon the Question of Life-Peerages, and create Lord Wensleydale an hereditary Peer—On the Motion of the Earl of Derby, a Select Committee is appointed relative to the Appellate Jurisdiction of the House—After Observations by Earl Granville, the Lord Chancellor, Lords Brougham, Campbell, and St. Leonards, a Committee is nominated—Their subsequent Report—The Appellate Jurisdiction Bill introduced in the Lords by the Lord Chancellor—After considerable Discussion it is passed, and goes down to the Commons—Occasions Lord Wensleydale to petition that House—The

Second Reading of the Bill moved by the Attorney-General—It is opposed by Mr. Bowyer, Mr. R. Phillimore, Sir J. Graham, Lord John Russell, and Mr. J. G. Phillimore, and supported by Mr. Roundell Palmer, Mr. Collier, Mr. Whiteside, and the Solicitor-General—The Motion is carried on a Division—Subsequently, on the Motion of Mr. Currie, the Bill is referred to a Select Committee, and its further progress thus stopped . [85

CHAPTER V.

INTERNATIONAL MARITIME LAW—Debate in the House of Lords upon Lord Colchester's Resolutions condemnatory of the Policy that "A Neutral Flag covers an Enemy's Goods"—The Earls of Carnarvon, Hardwicke, and Derby speak in favour of, and the Earls of Clarendon, Albemarle, Harrowby, and Grey, and the Duke of Argyll against, the Motion—It is negatived upon a Division—Motion by Mr. Napier in the Commons proposing the appointment of a Minister of Justice—His Speech—He is supported by Mr. Collier, Mr. Locke King, Mr. Wigram, Lord John Russell, and others—Mr. Baines, Sir G. Grey, Lord Palmerston, and Mr. Roundell Palmer also state their views—The same subject alluded to by Lord Brougham in the House of Lords in his speech relative to Judicial Statistics—In the House of Lords the Lord Chancellor calls attention to the Consolidation of the Statute Law—County Police Bill introduced by Sir G. Grey—Jealousy against the measure—Debate on the Second Reading—It is opposed by Sir G. Pechell, Sir J. Walmsley, Mr. W. J. Fox, Mr. Muntz, Mr. Deeds, Mr. Hadfield, Mr. Cobbett, Mr. Henley, and others, Mr. Pack, Mr. Bentinck, Sir W. Heathcote, Sir H. Stracey, and Mr. Cayley support the Bill, which ultimately becomes law—Bishops of London and Durham Retirement Bill is introduced in the Lords by the Chancellor—It is much opposed by the Bishops of Exeter and Oxford, the Duke of Newcastle, the Earl of Derby, and Lord Redesdale—Letters showing the terms of the negotiation—Renewed opposition on the Third Reading, which is carried—The Bill is strongly opposed in all its stages in the House of Commons by Sir W. Heathcote, Lord R. Cecil, Sir James Graham, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Napier, Mr. Henley, Mr. Roebuck, and Mr. T. Duncombe—The chief speakers in its favour are Lord Palmerston, Mr. M. Milnes, Mr. Cardwell, Sir J. Shelley, Mr. Walpole, and Sir G. Grey—The Bill ultimately passes [112

CHAPTER VI.

FINANCE—The Navy Estimates are moved by Sir C. Wood—Various topics connected with the subject are discussed by Captain Scobell, Admiral Berkeley, Sir Charles Napier, Sir Francis Baring, and others—At a subsequent period of the Session, Sir C. Wood also moves the Supplemental Estimates, when observations are made and suggestions offered by Admiral Walcott, Mr. Lindsay, Sir George Tyler, Sir Charles Napier, Sir

James Graham, and other Members—The Army Estimates are moved by Mr. Monsell—Explanations by Mr. F. Peel, and Observations of Colonel Dunne and Sir De Lacy Evans—Resolutions on the Income-Tax moved by Mr. Muntz—Speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in opposition to the Motion, which is negatived—Financial Statement by the Chancellor of the Exchequer relative to the remainder of the current Year—Comments of Mr. Gladstone and other Members—The Budget—Speeches of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Disraeli, Lord Palmerston, Sir Francis Baring, and Mr. Gladstone—Remarks by Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Alcock, and others [138]

CHAPTER VII.

NATIONAL EDUCATION.—Lord John Russell proposes his Resolutions—His speech—Remarks by several Members—Subsequently, in a Committee of the whole House, the Resolutions are debated—Speeches of Mr. Henley, Mr. Adderley, Mr. Warren, Sir James Graham, and Sir J. Pakington—Mr. Ellice, Mr. Liddell, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Milnes, and Mr. Ewart, also address the House—The Debate is adjourned, and continued by Lord John Russell, Sir G. Grey, Mr. E. Hall, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Drummond, Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Disraeli—On a Division, the Resolutions are rejected by a large majority—The Educational Estimates are introduced by Sir G. Grey—They are agreed to, after observations by Sir J. Pakington, Mr. Barnes, Mr. M. Gibson, Sir S. Northcote, Mr. Henley, Mr. Miles, Mr. W. J. Fox, and others—Cambridge University Reform Bill introduced—Debate on the Motion for going into Committee—Speeches of Mr. Bouverie and Mr. Walpole—The Measure undergoes considerable discussion in Committee, and various Amendments are moved by Mr. Heywood and other Members—In the House of Lords, Lords Lyndhurst and Lyttelton each move an Amendment, which is carried—The Commons agree to the Amendment, and the Bill passes—Education in Ireland—Mr. Walpole's Resolution upon—His speech—He is supported by Sir W. Heathcote, Mr. G. A. Hamilton, Mr. Napier, and opposed by Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Horsman, Mr. Deasy, and Mr. Hughes—The Resolution is carried against the Ministry upon a division—Subsequently, Mr. Fortescue moves a Counter-Resolution, which, after considerable discussion, is carried—Her Majesty's Answer to the Address upon Mr. Walpole's Resolution—The withdrawal of the Maynooth Grant is again brought forward by Mr. Spooner—After several Divisions, in which the Ministry are defeated, he introduces a Bill on the subject—Remarks of Sir J. Pakington on the Second Reading, which is also carried against the Ministry—Owing to the late period of the Session, the Bill is abandoned—Minister of Education—Bill passed for the appointment of [155]

CHAPTER VIII.

CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS—Motion by Lord Goderich—Statement by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as to the Results of Competitive Examination—Motion by General Evans, relative to the Abolition of the Sale of Commissions in the Army—A Debate ensues, in which the principal speakers are Lord Goderich, Mr. F. Peel, Lord Stanley, Mr. Sidney Herbert, and Lord Palmerston—The Motion is withdrawn—Military Education, Mr. Sidney Herbert calls attention to the state of—His speech—Observations of Mr. Peel, Lord Palmerston, General Evans, Lord Goderich, and other Members—AFFAIRS OF INDIA—The Earl of Albemarle moves Resolutions, and makes a Statement in the House of Lords, on the subject of the use of Torture in India—Speeches of the Duke of Argyll, the Earl of Ellenborough, and other Peers—In the House of Commons, Sir E. Perry calls attention to the increasing Deficit in the Revenue of India—Reply of Mr. V. Smith, and observations of Mr. Otway, Sir J. Hogg, and Mr. J. G. Phillimore—Indian Budget introduced by Mr. Vernon Smith—Comments of Sir E. Perry, Sir J. Hogg, Mr. Headlam, Mr. Otway, Mr. Danby Seymour, and Mr. I. Butt—Elaborate Review of the Parliamentary Session by Mr. Disraeli—Reply of Lord Palmerston—Mr. M. Gibson, Mr. Napier, Mr. Mowbray, Mr. Baines, Mr. Lowe, and others, make observations—Parliament Prorogued by Commission—The Queen's Speech—Statistical results of the Session—Law Reforms introduced by the Lord Chancellor and Sir Fitzroy Kelly respectively . . . [181

CHAPTER IX.

CONCLUSION OF WAR WITH RUSSIA—The Russian Government disposed to Peace—Mission of Count Esterhazy to St. Petersburg—The Austrian Proposals—Circular Dispatches of the Russian Cabinet—Agreement for a Conference at Paris—Meeting of the Conference—Articles of the Treaty of Peace—Conventions respecting the Dardanelles and Bosphorus; the Naval Forces of Russia and Turkey in the Black Sea; and the Aland Islands—Discussion at the Conference on the Press of Belgium, the Occupation of Greece and Italy by Foreign Troops, and the State of Naples—Debate in the Belgian Chambers on the question raised at the Conference relative to the Press—Important Resolutions of the Conference respecting Maritime Law—Reception of these by the United States—Final Evacuation of the Crimea by the Allied Armies—Manifesto of the Emperor of Russia—His Coronation—Imperial Ukase conceding important privileges to his subjects—Difficulties attending the Execution of the Treaty of Peace—The Questions of the Isle of Serpents and Bolgrad [209

CHAPTER X.

- FRANCE.—Opening of the French Legislative Chambers—Speech of the Emperor—Address to the Chamber by Count de Morny—Birth of an Imperial Prince—Reception of the Russian Ambassador at the Tuileries.
- SARDINIA.—Note or Protest of the Sardinian Plenipotentiaries to the English and French Governments—Speech of the Count de Cavour in the Sardinian Chamber.
- NAPLES.—Political Arrests and Cruelties practised by the Neapolitan Government—Remonstrances of the English and French Governments neglected—Determination of England and France to break off Diplomatic Intercourse with the Court of Naples—Communications on the subject—Withdrawal of the English and French Legations from Naples—Remonstrances of the Russian Cabinet—Attempt to assassinate the King of Naples.
- SPAIN.—Overthrow of the Espartero Ministry—Causes which led to it—Marshal O'Donnell forms a Ministry—Spain declared subject to Martial Law—Programme of the O'Donnell Ministry—Fighting in the Streets of Madrid—Address to the Queen by the Cortes—The Cortes dissolved—Article in the Paris *Moniteur*—Insurrectionary Movements in the Provinces—Proclamation by the Junta at Saragossa—Submission to the O'Donnell Government—Suppression of the National Guard—Fall of the O'Donnell Cabinet—A new Ministry formed by General Narvaez.
- SWITZERLAND.—Seizure of the Castle at Neufchâtel by the Royalists—Defeat of the Royalists—Interference by the King of Prussia—Nature of his claim as Prince of Neufchâtel—Interference of the German Confederation—Attitude of the Swiss Federal Council—Appeal to the French Emperor—Article in the *Moniteur* [227]

CHAPTER XI.

- INDIA.—Arrival of Viscount Canning, the new Governor-General of India—Proclamation of the Governor-General in Council announcing the Annexation of Oude.
- WAR WITH PERSIA.—Brief Account of Herat—Convention between Great Britain and Persia in 1853—Causes which led to the war with Persia—Proclamation of the Governor-General in Council—Arrival of the Expeditionary Force in the Persian Gulf—Attack and Defeat of the Persian Troops at Reshire—Bombardment of Bushire—The Surrender—Prospects of the Expedition.
- HOSTILITIES IN CHINA.—Articles of the Chinese Supplementary Treaty of 1843—Colonial Ordinance passed by the Legislative Council of Hong Kong—Question of the right to grant registers to vessels—Seizure by Chinese officers of the crew of the Arrow—Remonstrance addressed to Commissioner Yeh—Correspondence on the subject—Capture by the

English of the Dutch Folly Fort—Unsuccessful negotiations—Demand by the British Plenipotentiary, Sir John Bowring, of access to the interior of Canton—Origin of this claim—Bombardment of Canton—The British troops enter the city, and are subsequently withdrawn—Destruction of Chinese War Junks—Capture of the French Folly and Bogue Forts—The Foreign Factories at Canton burnt by the Chinese . . . [248

CHAPTER XII.

UNITED STATES.—The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of April, 1850—Question of the Mosquito Protectorate—History of Greytown—Nature of Disputes between Great Britain and the United States—Proclamation declaring the Bay Islands a British Colony—Offence given by this to the United States—Correspondence between Mr. Buchanan and the Earl of Clarendon on the subject—Failure of proposal to refer the question to decision of a third Power—Convention with the Republic of Honduras—Contest resulting from the attempt to introduce Slavery into Kansas—Account of the state of the Territory—Struggle between the House of Representatives and the Senate on the question of the Army Appropriation Bill—Extraordinary Meeting of Congress convoked—Termination of the Dispute—Mode of electing the President in the United States—Names of the different Candidates—Manifesto of Mr. Buchanan—Colonel Fremont—Election of Mr. Buchanan—Dismissal of the British Minister and three Consuls from the United States—Dispatch of Mr. Marcy to the Earl of Clarendon on the subject.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.—TOPICS.—Question of Slavery—Kansas—Customs—Army and Navy—Relations with Foreign Powers—Resolutions of the Paris Conference respecting Maritime Law—Nicaragua—Isthmus of Panama—Conclusion. [263

CHRONICLE.

EVENTS	Page 1
------------------	--------

APPENDIX TO CHRONICLE.

	Page
The MINISTRY	205
SHERIFFS for the year 1856	206
BIRTHS	208
MARRIAGES	215
DEATHS	226
PROMOTIONS	290

STATE PAPERS.

TREATIES:—

I. INTERNATIONAL.

General Treaty between Her Majesty, the Emperor of Austria, the Emperor of the French, the King of Prussia, the Emperor of Russia, and the King of Sardinia:—with the Conventions annexed	310
Declaration respecting Maritime Law	321
Treaty between Her Majesty, the Emperor of Austria, and the Emperor of the French, guaranteeing the Integrity of the Ottoman Empire	322
Treaty between Her Majesty, the Emperor of the French, and the King of Sweden and Norway	323
Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Reciprocal Establishment between Her Majesty and the Swiss Confederation	324
Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation between Her Majesty and the Republic of Chile	328
Convention between Her Majesty and the Emperor of Japan	334

II. FOREIGN. Page

Firman and Hatti-Sherif by the Sultan, relative to the Privileges and Reforms in Turkey	337
Protocol of Warsaw, relative to the Danish Succession (1851)	341

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

Warrant establishing the "Order of Victoria"	344
Returns of Casualties in the Crimea	347
LIST OF ACTS, Public and Private, passed in Session 1856	349
PRICES OF STOCKS	361
FINANCE ACCOUNTS	362
INDIAN REVENUE ACCOUNTS	378
AVERAGE PRICES OF CORN, HAY, STRAW, CLOVER, AND BUTCHER'S MEAT	379
TABLES OF MORTALITY; MARRIAGES, BIRTHS, AND DEATHS; METEOROLOGY; AND BANKRUPTS.	380
UNIVERSITY HONOURS:—	
Oxford	381
Cambridge	384

TRIALS, LAW CASES, &c.

The Rugeley Poisonings—Trial of William Palmer	387
The Leeds Poisoning Case—Trial of William Dove	529
PATENTS	540
POETRY	558
INDEX	566

ANNUAL REGISTER,

FOR THE YEAR

1856.

HISTORY OF EUROPE.

CHAPTER I.

State of public feeling at the opening of the year—Improved Condition of our Military Affairs—State of Trade and Commerce—Opening of Parliament—Queen's Speech—Debate on the Address in both Houses—Speeches of the Earls of Gosford and Abingdon, the mover and seconder—The severe criticisms of the Earl of Derby—Reply of the Earl of Clarendon—Remarks of the Earl Granville and Lord Campbell—In the Commons, Mr. Byng moves and Mr. Baxter seconds the Address—After observations by Mr. Disraeli, Lord Palmerston, Mr. Roebuck, Sir de Lacy Evans and others, the Address is agreed to—Surrender of Kars—Debate on the Motion of Mr. Whiteside—His Speech—Reply of the Attorney-General—Speeches of Lord John Manners and the Lord Advocate—The Debate is adjourned, and continued by Mr. J. G. Phillimore, Mr. Ker Seymer, who proposes an Amendment, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir J. Pakington, Mr. Layard, Sir W. Heathcote, Serjeant Shee and others—The Debate is again adjourned, when the principal speakers are Sir E. B. Lytton, Mr. Vernon Smith, Sir James Graham, Mr. Disraeli, Lord John Russell, and Lord Palmerston—After a reply from Mr. Whiteside the Motion is rejected—A Pension is conferred upon General Williams by Parliament—Sir Charles Napier's defence of his conduct whilst in command of the Fleet—Reply of Sir James Graham—Remarks of Sir M. F. Berkeley, Sir C. Wood, Mr. Malins, and others.

THE new year found the attention of the public still concentrated on the war. The partial

VOL. XCVIII.

success which had attended the arms of the allies before Sebastopol had to some extent diminished

[B]

the discontent occasioned by previous failures there, by the inaction of the naval forces in the Baltic, and by the surrender of Kars to the Russians. The necessities and comforts of our army in the Crimea were also provided for in such a manner as seemed to warrant a belief that an improvement had taken place in the administrative departments of our military system. Negotiations for a peace were already far advanced, but their progress was watched with no small doubt and anxiety, for a very general impression prevailed that by a further perseverance in the war the nation would fully redeem the discredit cast upon it by past military mismanagement and failures. Under these circumstances, therefore, the prospect of an immediate peace was by no means universally acceptable: moreover, the condition of the trade and commerce of the nation demonstrated that war and financial confusion were by no means inseparably connected; for the country had not only been able to meet satisfactorily all the sacrifices hitherto required of it, but was now in a condition of commercial prosperity fully equal to the average of ordinary times, and far greater than existed elsewhere, even amongst those more fortunate nations which had remained at peace.

In this condition of affairs Her Majesty in person opened the Parliamentary Session of 1856 with the usual magnificent ceremonial. The Royal Speech was as follows:—

“My Lords and Gentlemen,—

“Since the close of the last session of Parliament the arms of the Allies have achieved a signal

and important success. Sebastopol, the great stronghold of Russia in the Black Sea, has yielded to the persevering constancy and to the daring bravery of the allied forces.

“The naval and military preparations for the ensuing year have necessarily occupied my serious attention; but, while determined to omit no effort which could give vigour to the operations of the war, I have deemed it my duty not to decline any overtures which might reasonably afford a prospect of a safe and honourable peace. Accordingly, when the Emperor of Austria lately offered to myself and to my august ally, the Emperor of the French, to employ his good offices with the Emperor of Russia, with a view to endeavour to bring about an amicable adjustment of the matters at issue between the contending Powers, I consented, in concert with my allies, to accept the offer thus made, and I have the satisfaction to inform you that certain conditions have been agreed upon, which I hope may prove the foundation of a general treaty of peace.

“Negotiations for such a treaty will shortly be opened at Paris.

“In conducting those negotiations I shall be careful not to lose sight of the objects for which the war was undertaken; and I shall deem it right in no degree to relax my naval and military preparations until a satisfactory treaty of peace shall have been concluded.

“Although the war in which I am engaged was brought on by events in the south of Europe, my attention has not been withdrawn from the state of things in the north, and, in connection with the Emperor of the French, I

have concluded with the King of Sweden and Norway a treaty containing defensive engagements applicable to his dominions, and tending to the preservation of the balance of power in that part of Europe.

“ I have also concluded a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation with the republic of Chili. I have given directions that these treaties shall be laid before you.

“ Gentlemen of the House of Commons,—

“ The estimates for the ensuing year will be laid before you. You will find them framed in such a manner as to provide for the exigencies of war, if peace should unfortunately not be concluded.

“ My Lords and Gentlemen,—

“ It is gratifying to me to observe that, notwithstanding the pressure of the war, and the burdens and sacrifices which it has unavoidably imposed upon my people, the resources of my empire remain unimpaired. I rely with confidence on the manly spirit and enlightened patriotism of my loyal subjects for a continuance of that support which they have so nobly afforded me, and they may be assured that I shall not call upon them for exertions beyond what may be required by a due regard for the great interests, the honour, and the dignity of the empire.

“ There are many subjects connected with internal improvement which I recommend to your attentive consideration.

“ The difference which exists in several important particulars between the commercial laws of Scotland and those of the other parts of the United Kingdom has occasioned inconvenience to a large

portion of my subjects engaged in trade. Measures will be proposed to you for remedying this evil.

“ Measures will also be proposed to you for improving the laws relating to partnership, by simplifying those laws, and thus rendering more easy the employment of capital in commerce.

“ The system under which merchant shipping is liable to pay local dues and passing tolls has been the subject of much complaint. Measures will be proposed to you for affording relief in regard to those matters.

“ Other important measures for improving the law in Great Britain and in Ireland will be proposed to you, which will, I doubt not, receive your attentive consideration.

“ Upon these and all other matters upon which you may deliberate I fervently pray that the blessing of Divine Providence may favour your councils, and guide them to the promotion of the great object of my unvarying solicitude—the welfare and the happiness of my people.”

Both Houses of Parliament adjourned shortly afterwards. When they reassembled, the opening night of the session was occupied by a brief debate upon the Address, although no amendment was moved in either House.

In the House of Peers, after the Queen's Speech had been read, the Earl of Gosford rose and moved that an humble Address should be presented to Her Majesty in reply to her gracious Speech. After a brief preface, and having declared his full belief in the justice and necessity of the war, he said, that he had looked forward with joyous anticipation to the probable result of the campaign of 1856, but the

scene had changed, and he found himself suddenly, and somewhat reluctantly, an advocate of peace. The nation was only now beginning to shake off the rust of a long repose, and to make great preparations for continuing hostilities; it was natural there should be on the part of the public a certain reluctance to suspend them, but it was doubtful how far this feeling should be indulged if the terms of peace would prevent the aggressions of Russia not only against Turkey, but in other quarters, and leave no opening for future disputes. Thus far in his advocacy of peace he was ready to go, but no further, and he trusted the negotiations would be brought to a satisfactory conclusion. The noble Lord then very briefly noticed the paragraphs of the Royal Speech referring to internal affairs, and concluded by moving the Address.

The Earl of Abingdon took a wider range in seconding the Address. He said the mind of the country was undoubtedly agitated by anxiety in reference to the negotiations for peace, and by hope that they would be brought to a successful conclusion, one consistent with the honour and dignity of the country, and with the permanent tranquillity of Europe. He did not share the apprehensions on this point; he felt confident the negotiations would be satisfactorily concluded by Lord Clarendon, who had so long and successfully conducted the foreign affairs of the country. If the just demands of the nation were slighted, he contended that, from the relative position of Russia and England, this country was in a position to enforce them. Russia had commenced the war calculating that England would be unprepared for

it, yet we had sent out an army greater than this country had ever sent out before. They could point, too, to the achievements of that army with satisfaction — to the battles of Alma, of Inkermann, and to the brilliant, but fatal, cavalry charge at Balaclava, to the last with a satisfaction blended with regret. He also alluded to the decided superiority of the naval forces of England, and the complete revenge for the massacre of Sinope that had been taken by the destruction of the Black Sea fleet of Russia. He rejoiced that the negotiations were to be conducted in Paris, the capital of that illustrious Prince who swayed the destinies of a people renowned in arms and foremost among the nations of Europe in all the arts of civilisation. He could not find words sufficient to express his admiration of the conduct of that illustrious Prince and the people over whom he reigned, in having come forward in so honourable a manner, forgetting all former occurrences and entering into so cordial an alliance with this country. He concluded by appealing to their Lordships to put party spirit in abeyance, urging them to show that there was perfect unanimity in the British Parliament, and that, anxious as we were for peace, yet if that peace could not be obtained on a firm, safe, and honourable basis, we were unanimous in our determination to support the Crown in an instant, immediate, and vigorous resumption of hostilities.

The Earl of Derby fully agreed with the conclusion of Lord Abingdon's remarks; he, however, proceeded to criticise severely the Queen's Speech. He must be permitted, he said, to deal with it as

it was, and not as it was not—as the Speech of the Ministers, not as the Speech of the Sovereign. In documents of that kind we did not look for ornaments of style or elegance of diction, we were satisfied with plain English: but of all the documents of the kind he ever met with, there was none that could so little pretend to the graces of diction, or even to the intelligible conveyance of information. Of course he did not know who suggested the paragraphs relating to the war; but if Lord Panmure suggested them, “it must have been at the close of one of those exhausting attacks to which he as well as I am unfortunately subject, or under the influence not more exhilarating of that meagre diet which is their necessary accompaniment. The Speech is redolent of water-gruel.” (*Laughter.*) The document reminded him of those school-day “themes” in which care was taken not to exceed the allotted six-and-thirty lines, and within that limit “to dilute with the largest possible amount of feeble and unmeaning language the smallest modicum of sense.” They did not desire to see the longwindedness of a President’s message; but they had been accustomed to see some notice taken of our foreign relations—some indication that they had an Indian empire, some reminder that they had colonial possessions, some mention of their commerce and internal affairs. But the Speech of that day was so bare, so bald, so meagre as to warrant the distinction that it was not the Speech of a Sovereign but of a Minister. Had Her Majesty been left to the promptings of her own heart, could those who had observed the warm, kindly, womanly sympathy

she had shown to her wounded soldiers, watching their sick-beds, and decorating the survivors with her own hand, believe that she would have used the cold language of the Speech, and confined the expression of her feelings to the simple statement, that since the close of the last session of Parliament, Sebastopol, the great stronghold of Russia in the Black Sea, had yielded to the persevering constancy and to the daring bravery of the allied forces? Her Majesty would have expressed a very deep sense of gratitude to the Almighty, and have asked her Parliament to join in the expression of gratitude to those brave men, who, under Almighty Providence, had been enabled to achieve so important a success. That would have strengthened the flame of loyalty that burned in the troops, and have encouraged those deeds of daring on which the language of the Speech was calculated to throw a damp. The House was asked to thank Her Majesty for the information that the great stronghold of Russia in the Black Sea was captured,—information which for the last three months had been notorious all over the world. “Within that time information of that fact, so far as it is a fact—because unhappily it is not a fact—might be derived from the columns of any newspaper.” We had obtained the southern side of Sebastopol; the Russians had destroyed their fleet; we had blown or were blowing up the docks; but the stronghold on the northern side still held us at defiance.

Turning to the next paragraph, he rejoiced to learn that naval and military preparation for the ensuing year had occupied the Go-

vernment; for, much as he should welcome a peace that would secure the objects of the war, it would be a permanent disgrace to this country if we accepted a peace that fell short of those objects. He could not blame the Government for entering into negotiations, although he might entertain considerable doubt with regard to the quarter from which they proceeded. But the language of the paragraph in which those negotiations were mentioned was not satisfactory. It would have been more gratifying if the Government could have stated that the Emperor of Austria had applied for the sanction of the Emperor of Russia to employ his good offices with the Sovereigns of France and England; for, from the language of the Speech, the impression in Europe would be that we were virtually applicants to Russia for peace, and not that Russia was the applicant. (“No, No!” *from the Ministerial benches.*) “Noble Lords opposite say ‘No, no.’ The statement they make is this—that Austria has applied for your consent to employ her good offices with Russia towards obtaining the assent of Russia to certain conditions in which you have signified your concurrence.” If Russia were not the party preserving the right to grant the conditions submitted to her, or to refuse them, he did not understand the force of language.

Lord Derby next commented on two remarkable omissions from the Speech—Sardinia was altogether ignored; not one mention was made of Turkey. He thought Turkey was a principal in the war; but now, forsooth, propositions of peace were made to and accepted by France and England! Lord Derby was not surprised at

another omission. If such ungracious terms were applied to those who had succeeded, it was no wonder that no language was found to record the matchless endurance and gallantry of those who, in a distant and deserted Asiatic town, had so nobly maintained the honour of English arms. But might not words have been found to cheer those whose gallantry had consigned them to the depths of a prison? Standing in that place, feeling that his words might reach them in their prison, he would say to a Williams, a Teesdale, a Lake, a Thompson—“You may rest assured that this House and the country deeply sympathise with you in your misfortunes; that we honour the valour and prize the fame of the brave defenders of Kars as not below those of the more fortunate conquerors at Sebastopol.” Well might a blush rise to the cheek of the Minister, and well might he hesitate when about to inscribe in a Queen’s Speech the significant word “Kars,”—a name of immortal honour to its defenders, but equally a name of eternal reproach and shame to those who had left that devoted band unsuccoured and unavenged. He did not know to what influence we might ascribe this fatal disaster. He would mention a rumour, that, if possible, it might meet with prompt and explicit denial. It was said that Kars was neglected because of some miserable jealousy between two great allies—a paltry fear that we should be seeking our exclusive interest in Asia. Any measure having for its object the exclusive advantage of England only, would be unworthy of a British Government; but it would be equally unworthy of our illustrious Ally for him to harbour

a dark suspicion against our Government. Such an unfounded mistrust would show, that whatever the alliance might be in name, it was nothing in substance; it would paralyse our efforts: for us to yield would be degrading and humiliating, and we should be reduced from complete equality to the miserable position of obsequiously following in the wake of France. It was also said that Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople had treated with contempt urgent demands for aid: but until he should have had the most indisputable evidence of it in writing, Lord Derby said he could not believe that the Ambassador could have so far forgotten his duty to the Queen. He hoped the Government would lay on the table the papers relating to the disastrous abandonment of Kars. *Primâ facie*, there was a grievous charge against the Government. Where was the Turkish contingent? Where the men raised under the Foreign Enlistment Act? How were we to account for the imprisonment of thirty or forty thousand troops at Eupatoria? He demanded an explanation of an occurrence that had filled the enemy with exultation and the heart of the British nation with painful emotions. Returning to the prospects of peace and the pending negotiations, Lord Derby expressed his concurrence in the view that the Foreign Secretary had formerly expressed of the objects of the war; and distinctly intimated the course he should take. "I am prepared to give Her Majesty's Government this assurance, that during the course of the deliberations now about to be entered on, I will myself carefully abstain—and I will impress

on all with whom I have the slightest influence the necessity of refraining—from making any comments, suggestions, or observations which can have the effect of unnecessarily embarrassing the Government in the conduct and management of the negotiations . . . They shall be vexed with no wanton interference, with no vexatious comments, with no unnecessary questions; and that no impediment shall be offered to the course of their proceedings until they shall have brought us to one of two issues—a durable and honourable peace, or the renewal of a just and necessary war." (*Cheers.*) He disclaimed altogether the doctrine that Parliament should be the constant and daily adviser of the Sovereign in matters of peace and war. Those matters were the prerogative of the Crown, exercised by its responsible Minister. When the Minister had performed his task, then it was for Parliament to approve or condemn. But he trusted that there would be no indefinite and uncertain suspension of hostilities—no armistice, if possible—certainly none by sea; and not an indefinite prolongation of perhaps fruitless negotiations, which would spoil our opportunities and enable Russia to recruit her strength. Lord Derby then referred to the treaty with Sweden and Norway—"the effect of which is that we bind ourselves that Sweden shall not be robbed, and Sweden binds herself that she will not be robbed if she can help it." He made a sarcastic comment on the "geographical tour" of Her Majesty from north to south, and thence to Chili; and expressed a desire to know what was going on in the East and West, at Teheran and Washington. The rupture

with Persia seemed slight and trivial, but the case was different with the United States. There was no country with which we are so closely bound, "none with which a war would be so mutually suicidal as with the United States." He concurred with the Government in the construction put upon the Clayton-Bulwer treaty; but with regard to the enlistment question, although Government had made every *amende* and every apology, the United States had just cause of complaint. If the Government did not infringe the letter, they went into opposition to the spirit of the municipal laws of the United States. At the same time, he hoped the United States would accept the ample apology offered, and that more friendly relations would exist in that quarter. Finally, he strongly condemned the novel and, as he believed, unconstitutional proceeding which the Ministry had adopted in conferring a life peerage upon Mr. Baron Parke; observing, "It appears to me, my Lords, that that peerage has been conferred most unnecessarily and gratuitously as far as regards the limitation for life, because the distinguished person on whom it has been conferred has no son, nor is he likely to have one. A peerage, therefore, of such a description can only have been conferred in order to try the prerogative of the Crown. Now, my Lords, without venturing to discuss the constitutional side of the question, I may venture to say that when it is sought to exercise a prerogative, or supposed prerogative, of the Crown, of such a nature, such a subject ought not to be passed over in silence on the first night of our meeting. It is a prerogative which has never been exercised for a space of three hun-

dred or four hundred years—one which during that space the greatest sticklers for prerogative have never ventured to advise, and which those who have been most desirous to swamp your Lordships' House have never dared to recommend. The gratuitous assumption of such a prerogative is a matter of the deepest consideration, and I earnestly exhort all your Lordships—for the subject is one which concerns all, and which especially affects the constitutional liberty of the country—to carefully consider whether you will, or can, or ought, to submit to the exercise of a prerogative which has been dormant for many years, and which, as I believe, at no time your Lordships' House has ever sanctioned as conferring a right to sit and vote in Parliament."

The Earl of Clarendon, in reply to the speech of Lord Derby, justified the language of the Speech from the Throne, and the general policy of the Administration. With regard to the state of our relations with America, he believed them to be capable of a speedy and amicable arrangement. He entreated their Lordships to suspend their judgment until the whole of the papers had been laid before Parliament. The noble Earl had alluded to reports which had been widely circulated with regard to the feeling said to exist in the French Government or the French nation with respect to assistance having been withheld from Kars. He did not mean to say that the French press might not have broached the idea that, if the war were to be carried into Asia Minor, it would be a waste of French blood and French treasure for English purposes; but he must give the most unqualified denial

to the supposition that such was the opinion of the French Emperor or of the French Government.

Upon the origin and present state of the negotiations Lord Clarendon explained that Her Majesty's Government never were disinclined to listen to overtures of peace, and they were all along anxious to bring the war to a satisfactory conclusion. It certainly was not for England and France to make any overtures to Russia; and he thought we could understand, and, he had almost said, could respect the motives which induced Russia not to make overtures to us; but Austria was in a position to proffer her good offices, and the time that she chose for doing it was an excellent one, when the approach of winter rendered the cessation of hostilities necessary. But it was no mediation which Austria offered. She simply offered to ascertain and make known at St. Petersburg the terms upon which the Allies would consent to peace; and he must do the Austrian Government the justice to say, that, from the first, they admitted the necessity that those terms should be clear and precise, in order to do away as much as possible with the chance of misapprehension, and, by avoiding those misunderstandings and complications which arose last year, to bring the negotiations to a successful issue. It was impossible for Her Majesty's Government, according to their sense of duty, to refuse those good offices. ("Hear!") However confident they might have been that another campaign would have increased the military fame of England, and might have led to a treaty of a different and more comprehensive character, yet such anticipations would have been

wholly unjustifiable if they had induced the Ministry to prolong the war when a prospect appeared of attaining the objects for which that war was undertaken; and, notwithstanding the spirit which now animated this country, he believed that the cool judgment and right reason of the people of England would approve the course which the Ministry had taken. ("Hear!") The original proposal of Austria was to communicate those terms to Russia on her own responsibility; but they saw that it would be useless for Austria to send those terms to St. Petersburg without the sanction of the Allies; and there was no disrespect intended either to Sardinia or to Turkey by omitting them from the Queen's Speech. They were deeply sensible of the courage which Sardinia had evinced, and of the manner in which she embarked in the contest, and in which she had carried out her engagements; but they thought that it was simply necessary for Her Majesty to declare that, in concert with her allies, she had consented to accept the good offices of Austria with the Emperor of Russia. Austria, however, became a party to the terms in question; she made herself responsible for them, and she entered into engagements to break off her diplomatic relations with Russia if they were rejected, and afterwards to concert with the Allies as to the means of coercing Russia. Those terms were sent by the Austrian Minister to St. Petersburg; he was to ask for a categorical answer—yes or no. He was simply the bearer of a despatch; he was forbidden to discuss its contents, and he was, on no account, to admit any modifications or counter-propositions

whatever. The answer of Russia was transmitted direct to Vienna. It was not in the form required by Austria, but contained some very important modifications, and the Austrian Government thereupon informed the Russian Minister at Vienna that, unless a categorical answer were received within a stated period, the Austrian minister with the whole of the mission at St. Petersburg would leave that city, and passports would be sent to the Russian legation at Vienna. That was communicated by Prince Gortschakoff to his Government, upon which an acceptance, pure and simple, was sent by telegraph to Vienna. The despatches containing it arrived at Vienna on the 24th instant. The substance of it had been communicated to Her Majesty's Government on the 29th ultimo, and the plan which was proposed to be adopted was this—that the terms which had been accepted by Russia should be agreed to by the representatives of the Allies at Vienna; that the representatives should then sign a short protocol, agreeing that the preliminaries should be signed at Paris; that an armistice should be entered upon, and that the provisions of the treaty should then be determined. Although he should not enter further at that time into the terms or duration of the armistice, and thought that it would not be right to discuss it at that time, yet he must take the opportunity of saying, that he entirely agreed with the noble Earl opposite, that it should be of the shortest possible duration. (“Hear, hear!”) He had then informed their Lordships of the existing state of affairs, and he would not deny that great doubt and anxiety were entertained as to the result. It was impossible to

deny that doubt was felt as to the sincerity with which Russia might have accepted the conditions. The very readiness which she had shown in accepting them had increased that doubt, and the manner in which she had proceeded last year, after having purely and simply accepted the terms then proposed, had still further added to it. We could only hope that Russia was sincere—for his own part he believed that she was. He thought that Russia desired a peace, and he thought that the Emperor of Russia had shown great moral courage in at once accepting terms which he had reason to believe were displeasing to the war party in Russia. (“Hear, hear!”) He hoped he would continue to exhibit the same moral courage, and that he would, without any attempt at evasion, abide by the letter and spirit of these terms. Should he do so, he thought we had a prospect of speedily obtaining that which had throughout been the object of the war—a safe and honourable peace. (“Hear, hear!”) By an honourable peace, he meant a peace which would be honourable to both parties, for a peace which would degrade Russia would not be a safe peace. For his own part, he thought that Russia had accepted conditions which would cast no stain upon her.

He then expressed a full reliance upon the sincerity of Russia, and gave an unqualified denial to the report that the English Government were entering upon the negotiations in a spirit of insincerity, or sought to sacrifice the opportunities of peace to the desire for military glory. In conclusion, he stated that “the sentiments of Her Majesty's Government are entirely shared by the Empe-

ror of the French. ('Hear, hear!') I hope it is not presumptuous in me to say that the judgment, firmness, and moderation—the straightforward and honourable conduct of His Majesty's Government in these matters are beyond all praise. The Emperor of the French desires peace, but he will make no peace which is inconsistent with the dignity and honour of France. Like Her Majesty's Government, he is determined that the naval and military preparations shall go on with uninterrupted activity, in order that both countries shall be completely prepared for war on the very day on which it is understood that the negotiations for peace have failed." (*Cheers.*)

The Earl of Granville, in the course of a few remarks, alluded to the objection taken by Lord Derby to the recent grant of a life peerage, and hoped that when the subject came under discussion, it would be treated without party spirit.

Lord Campbell expressed extreme doubt whether the creation of a life peerage was lawful, or whether it could be done without the authority of Parliament, and a new law to alter the established precedent.

The Address was then agreed to, and the House adjourned.

In the House of Commons the Address was moved by Mr. Byng, who, in a brief speech, sketched the leading events of the war. He submitted that its results were highly satisfactory, and that with respect to peace, if the details of the terms corresponded to the outline already presented, an honourable and secure peace lay in prospect. Should peace unhappily not result from the negotiations about

to open, the course of the country and her allies was clear. In conclusion, he asked for the patience and moderation of the House and country while so great a stake was trembling in the balance.

Mr. Baxter seconded the Address in a congratulatory speech upon the internal condition of the country, and upon the unanimity of sentiment which characterized most classes in the conduct of the war. The negotiations, he contended, should be undertaken by us with the sword in our hands, and no relaxation made in our warlike preparations until peace was definitely concluded.

He was followed by Mr. Disraeli, who spoke briefly. He began by expressing his satisfaction that Her Majesty should have acceded to conditions which she hoped might prove "the foundation of a safe and honourable peace;" and that she would not lose sight of the objects of the war. He could not criticise the terms of peace, for no authentic information on the subject was before the House; and he hoped that under these circumstances the House would exercise "that prudent but high-spirited reserve which, while it shrinks from embarrassing a Minister on whom is about to devolve the fulfilment of so difficult a duty, will at the same time watch with the utmost vigilance—I will not say suspicion—the course of all his proceedings." No little advantage would be gained from the prosecution of negotiations while Parliament was sitting. The fact that Parliament was assembled would exercise a salutary moral influence on the conferences. Mr. Disraeli said that he was glad to hear—so many statements had been made on the subject by persons in autho-

rity—that Government, in attempting to conclude a peace, would seek to attain the purposes for which the war was undertaken. A noble Lord assured the other House that one of the objects of the war was to vindicate the oppressed nationalities. In a few days that noble Lord was called to take one of the highest places in Her Majesty's councils: of course, the object was to subject his too fervid enthusiasm to the cooler atmosphere of cabinet society! It showed, at all events, that gentlemen should be cautious. Mr. Disraeli deprecated the continuance of the war for the sake of adding lustre to our arms. The abstract principle that we should continue a war to gratify the vanity or support the reputation of the community was questionable; but in any case it did not apply to our circumstances. The lustre of our arms had not been dimmed. He could not easily describe the immensity of the resources at our disposal and the energy we had already displayed. But it was monstrous to say that nations should never engage in war unless they are sure to win great victories that would figure among the decisive battles of the world. That would be to degrade us from the vindicators of public law to the gladiators of history. Mr. Disraeli alluded to the serious catastrophe of Kars, with its omission from the Speech; and said that the Government must fully understand, that it was a subject upon which the country and the House would expect and require the most ample explanation. He then pronounced a short eulogy upon the defenders of Kars. "Let us," said he, "at least, whether there be peace or whether there be

war—let us express our admiration of those who, although they may have been unfortunate, were not subdued—(*Cheers*)—let us express our sympathy for an energy, perhaps excessive, and for a courage which we know was unsupported—(*Cheers*)—and at a moment when we are called upon, and rightly called upon, to express our admiration of the great achievement which has rendered the names of the Allies illustrious in the Black Sea—let us vindicate the conduct of those who, though not crowned with success, were at least crowned with glory in another place, and let us make our absent countrymen understand, that it is the man who deserves, and not the man who achieves, success, that is honoured by us." (*Loud and protracted cheering.*)

At the close of his speech, referring to the possibility of a slip between the cup and the lip in the peace negotiations, he remarked, "All this I admit; but we have at least the satisfaction of knowing, that if Her Majesty fails in the negotiations which are now about to be carried on—if the conditions of peace, of which the noble Lord is cognizant, but with which we are unacquainted, may not effect that great result which is now generally expected and generally desired—we have the satisfaction of knowing that Her Majesty may appeal with confidence to her Parliament to support her in a renewed struggle; and that there is no sum which Parliament will not cheerfully vote, or her people cheerfully raise, to vindicate her honour and maintain the independence and interests of her kingdom." (*Cheers.*)

Lord Palmerston then rose and said, that nothing could be more becoming than the position filled

by Mr. Disraeli, and the course he had taken on that occasion. He entirely agreed, that when great national questions were pending between the Government of this and other countries, so far from being hurtful, the presence of Parliament gave strength to the Government, and was a check upon it should it wish to depart from its duty. Therefore it had been rumoured that Government intended to propose an adjournment: such a thought had never passed through their minds. With regard to the negotiations, as soon as any step was taken—as soon as Ministers could consistently with the public interest do so—they would give the House every information. It would be their duty to urge the country to continue the war, if we could not accomplish those objects for which the war was undertaken. “No doubt the resources of the country are unimpaired. No doubt the naval and military preparations which have been making during the past twelve months, which are now going on, and which will be completed in the spring, will place this country in a position as regards the continuance of hostilities, in which it has not stood since the commencement of the war. We should, therefore, be justified in expecting that another campaign—should another campaign be forced upon us—would result in successes which might perhaps entitle us to require, perhaps enable us to obtain, even better conditions than those which have been offered to us and have been accepted by us. But if the conditions which we now hope to obtain are such as will properly satisfy the objects for which we are contending—if they are conditions

which we think it is our duty to accept, and with which we believe the country will be satisfied—then undoubtedly we should be wanting in our duty, and should not justify the confidence which the country has reposed in us, if we rejected terms of that description merely for the chance of greater successes in another campaign. These were the feelings which actuated Her Majesty’s Government. We felt, like many others in this country, that the future chances of the war were in our favour; we felt, like many others in this country, that the available resources of the enemy with whom we are contending were daily diminishing, while our resources, our preparations, and our means of carrying on the war, were continually increasing. But we felt that we should not be justified in rejecting overtures which promised the possibility of a safe and honourable peace, merely for the prospect of obtaining even greater successes in another year of war. Sir, I think the country will approve the course which we have pursued.” England had no need to continue hostilities for the sake of glory; and if our objects could be gained by other means, not for glory or victories should we continue the war. In a strain of high eulogy Lord Palmerston referred to the gallant defenders of Kars: defeat was most honourable to those who surrendered, more honourable than many successful resistances recorded in history. Government had taken all the measures in their power to obtain the exchange of General Williams and his brave companions; and he trusted that they would in due course be regularly exchanged. Making some slight references to measures of domestic

improvement, Lord Palmerston concluded by assuring the House that they were prepared to enter on the negotiations on the footing suggested by Mr. Disraeli—that Ministers should not be embarrassed by premature discussions, but that Parliament should reserve its right to confirm what was done in conformity with duty, and to manifest displeasure if confidence had been misplaced.

Mr. Roebuck observed that the punishment of a Minister was but a poor recompense for the loss of honour. In his view, it was for Parliament to watch over the interest of England and chalk out the course which the Minister should pursue. He had no confidence in Lord Palmerston. "We have seen a great country brought imprudently into a great war; we have seen that war inefficiently conducted; it becomes our duty to see that we do not come out of that war with disgrace." Mr. Roebuck took Lord Palmerston to task for not telling them why we went to war. He would supply the noble Lord's place. We went to war in the interest of humanity. We shamefully allowed Russia to pursue her designs, until she threatened the existence of Turkey. Once in possession of the territories of Turkey, Russia would be formidable to England in India. When Russia crossed the Pruth, England, taking fright, saw Russia becoming dangerous to her, and went to war; still for the interests of humanity, for the interests of England and of humanity were one. Having set this forth, Mr. Roebuck entered upon a sweeping criticism of our campaign; he declared that our honour was tarnished; and prophesied that if peace should be made,

Russia would be in Constantinople in ten years. He also criticised the Austrian propositions, and called upon the House to watch carefully over the negotiations.

Sir De Lacy Evans did not agree with Mr. Roebuck as to the origin of the war. He did not see the slightest ground for being alarmed at Russian projects on our Indian border. We went to war, not to protect India, but to defend civilization and enforce public law. As to negotiations, Sir De Lacy regarded the terms offered as the minimum which could be accepted by us.

After some brief observations by other members, the Address was agreed to without a dissident.

On the 28th of April, a debate, which had been long threatened, respecting the fate of Kars, was originated in the House of Commons by Mr. Whiteside, who moved the following resolution:—"That while this House feels it to be its duty to express its admiration of the gallantry of the Turkish soldiery and of the devotion of the British officers at the siege of Kars, it feels it to be equally a duty to express its conviction that the capitulation of that fortress and the surrender of the army which defended it, thereby endangering the safety of the Asiatic provinces of Turkey, were in a great measure owing to the want of foresight and energy on the part of Her Majesty's Administration."

Mr. Whiteside began by showing that Russia had long since designed to conquer Asiatic Turkey and Persia; that it was solely with this object that she had secured a transit across the Caucasus; that the root of Russian power, as opposed to England's

Indian Empire and to Asiatic Turkey, lay in Georgia; and that the duty of a British Minister who understood his duty, when war broke out between Russia and Turkey, was to assist the latter at the right time and with the right means. The interests of England in the East could not be considered apart from the interests of Turkey and Persia; and all these facts were patent to the British Minister who began the war. Having laid this down, Mr. Whiteside next insisted that as, when the war broke out in 1853, we for our own purposes pursued a repressive policy towards Turkey and prevented her from taking the field, we were bound to assist her afterwards in her extremity. He pictured the disastrous Asiatic campaign in 1854, ending in the rout of Kurukdere, to show that Russia was then only arrested in her career of victory by the impetuous foray made by Schamyl upon Tiflis: if you would strike a blow at Russia, you should aim at her in Georgia, which was the root of her power. When these events took place, it was time for the English Minister to put himself in motion.

“And so he did—he began to concoct materials for a blue-book, by sending a commissioner to Asiatic Turkey to pick up political information, and report on the condition and restore the efficiency of the Turkish army. But, unfortunately, Lord Clarendon forgot or neglected to state what means were at the Commissioner’s command. “Except his indomitable courage, his innate energy, his sense of duty, his mother-wit, and his English heart, I know of none that were at his disposal. Instead of powder and shot, they provided him with a plentiful supply of

paper and ink; and I will do him the justice to say, that from the moment he reached Erzeroum he bombarded his correspondents as vigorously, though not, unhappily, with so much success as he has ever done the Russians.”

He then commented upon the conduct of Lord Stratford, and charged the Government with having sent out Colonel Williams to do what he could without authority to do anything, and with such instructions that no one should ever be able to say why he was sent out. He charged Lord Stratford with having given the Commissioner good advice—to remodel, to re-form the Turkish army; a thing he was resolved should never come about. The motives of Lord Stratford he was utterly unable to comprehend; the conduct of Lord Stratford he was unable to understand or justify. He would not censure the Government and shelter a man who deserved censure, not so much as they, but who unquestionably deserved it.

Commenting on the use made of the Levantine Count Pisani by Lord Stratford, Mr. Whiteside remarked that when Lord Stratford wanted anything done he went to the Porte himself, when he wished a thing not done he sent Count Pisani. Conscious that he would be called to account, he took precautions for his defence, and it was Pisani who kept the curious record. Why were the services of the Count preferred? Was it that the other attachés were English gentlemen, and not so ready as Pisani to give pleasant answers to the queries of the Ambassador? Lord Stratford in one of his despatches spoke of the few favoured States where public opinion proclaimed the danger from corrup-

tion, and suggested the remedy. The noble writer alluded to public opinion. "Does he think that public opinion is respected in a country where conduct such as he himself pursues can with safety be passed over unnoticed by the Government? Well may he talk of public opinion, if the acts that he himself does in violation of his manifest duty, at an unparalleled crisis, can be covered or defended by the Government that maintains him in an office for which he has proved himself so wholly unfit." Mr. Whiteside admitted the foresight and dwelt on the energetic language of Lord Clarendon; who discovered the misconduct and was aware of the defaults of Lord Stratford in his neglect of General Williams. But in his defence Lord Stratford made a clear, explicit, point-blank request that the Foreign Secretary would explain once for all the relative duties and the relative authority conferred on General Williams. There was no answer defining the powers of General Williams. How did this case stand? Take it as put in the strongest possible manner for the Government:—"Lord Stratford de Redcliffe is an extraordinarily intractable and clever man; he was our Ambassador at Constantinople; he failed to perform duties required of him, and the Foreign Secretary censured him.' But where, I ask, is the Ambassador? He is there still. (*Cheers.*) Yet if the army in Asia was disorganized by the unaccountable behaviour, apathy, and neglect of the Ambassador, how can any one maintain that the mere fact of their having censured Lord Stratford exonerates the Government from all responsibility in reference to this case?" (*Cheers.*)

He then reviewed the Kars Blue-Book relating to the measures discussed for the relief of Kars, with the object of showing that it was the deliberate purpose of Lord Panmure not in any way to contribute to the prosecution of the war in Asia; of making out that all Ministers did contribute was four men and a doctor—nothing more; of exposing the "signal imbecility" of the War Minister; the "cowardly suggestions of Lord Clarendon"—"if the army cannot maintain Kars, it should fall back on Erzeroum"—compared with the intrepid resolution of General Williams, who forced the Muchir to forego his inglorious purpose of evacuating Kars in June. On Lord Panmure's despatch condemning the plan of the Porte for the relief of Kars, by the employment of the Contingent and other troops in Mingrelia, Mr. Whiteside thus commented:—"Am I pressing the despatch of Lord Panmure too far against the noble Lord when I say that, although conscious of the state of things in Asia, he said there were no means of relieving Brigadier-General Williams and his friends? Here is a War Minister of a suggestive mind! Here is a man of capacious intellect! Here is a Minister to conduct a great war! It was said by Edmund Burke, in proposing his measure for the conciliation of America—and the observation is a profound, although, apparently, a very simple one—'It is easy to object;' and a greater philosopher than Burke has described to us a class of persons who appear to be wise by always objecting, because then there is an end of the business; whereas, if you were to assent, there would be something to be done, some energy

to be employed, some skill to be made use of, some risk to be run, from which the small mind shrinks, and against which it shelters itself under its own incapacity, pronounces that the thing cannot be done, and leaves valuable lives and the honour of the country to be sacrificed by its imbecility."

Turning, then, to the negotiations concerning the plan of Omar Pasha, he threw equal blame upon the authorities who, two thousand miles off, gave orders as to details which they did not comprehend. He implied blame upon Lord Clarendon for consulting with the French Government; and he put in a telling light all the facts most adverse to the Government,—praising Omar Pasha, defending the Turkish officers, defending Lord Stratford—"always in the right," after he made up his quarrel with General Williams. He condemned Ministers for not having asked for the money—50,000*l.* or 100,000*l.*—that would have saved Kars; and he charged Lord Panmure with something like falsehood.

"Did Lord Panmure write a despatch on the 14th of July to say that there was no room for hope? Did this noble Lord, who is the War Minister of England, write a despatch to say it was 'too late to regret the policy which has left General Williams and his army exposed to such straits?' Did he read that despatch of the 3rd of August to the French Government? He did. And yet, when asked in public for information relative to the war, he says, 'I think Turkey in Asia will be able to maintain herself.' Why, if the House will pardon that conduct on the part of a Minister who is bound to speak the truth

—if it will tolerate conduct such as that—talk not to me of Ministerial responsibility. It is a farce—an idle ceremony. That statement was made to lull the public suspicion—to calm the public mind. It was made as this Parliament was about to break up for the session. I impeach this Minister for shameful neglect; and I charge him for having perverted his duty, not only to his allies and to his Sovereign, but to the sacred cause of truth." (*Cheers.*)

In the course of his speech he demanded the vote of Lord John Russell, quoting a passage from that noble Lord's speech in explanation of his abandonment of Lord Aberdeen in 1855; he observed that Lord John, like a true patriot, upset the Aberdeen Ministry, because it did not carry on the war with vigour. "There is something very singular in the account given by the noble Lord of that Government. He seems to have considered that the combination of the Premier, Lord Aberdeen, with the War Minister, the Duke of Newcastle, occasioned all the difficulty, because if we had a good War Minister and a bad Prime Minister, or a good Prime Minister and a bad War Minister, public affairs might be successfully conducted, but with the conjunction of two bad Ministers that was absolutely impossible. Nay, the noble Lord pushed the argument to this singular extent—he says, if the fiery spirit of the noble member for Tiverton, in the capacity of War Minister, had been added to the rigid nature of the Earl of Aberdeen, the mixture would have been a good one. The noble Lord illustrated his meaning by historic references with which his richly-cultivated mind enables him to supply him-

self, and thus to enliven our debates. Why, if Lord North had been in the place of Lord Chatham we should not have made the conquest of Canada; and if Lord Chatham had been in the place of Lord North, we should not have had to lament the capitulation of Saratoga. Who is Lord North? We can guess—(*Loud laughter*)—but the modern Chatham is now before us—(*Renewed laughter and cheers*)—he who is to exalt the nation to the height of glory, to terrify the enemies of England by his name, and, like his immortal predecessor, to make his influence felt wherever war rages in every quarter of the globe. (*Cheers and laughter.*) The flatterers of Lord Palmerston say that he succeeded to his position at a time of great difficulty. That is true; but such was his ambition. Times of calamity and confusion produce the greatest minds. It is then that the genius of the statesman shines conspicuous amid the general gloom, as lightning is most brilliant in contrast with the darkest clouds. The noble Member for London, however, only wanted one great Minister, but he got two—a Prime Minister of surpassing energy, and a War Minister of surprising genius. Let us inquire whether their action has been equal to their ability; and then I will ask the noble Lord whether his splendid illusion is not dispelled, and whether, with reference to the sentiments he expressed on the occasion to which I have referred—if the war in Asia does not appear to have been conducted with due energy and vigour—he can, as a conscientious man, vote against the resolution I am about to submit to the House.”

After speaking for upwards of

four hours, he concluded with an animated peroration, asking, “Where is the foresight—where the ability—where the brilliant enterprise, well conceived and ably executed—where the comprehensive design—where the judicious use of the wealth of the world or of that mighty fleet which is said to be able to sweep the seas? Search through this mass of jargon, and you will look in vain for the evidence of wisdom or vigour. Here you have idle words for brilliant deeds—polished phrases for prompt and decisive actions. Turkey expected and deserved more from England, and therefore, Sir, I place this resolution in your hands, invoking in its support the votes of a patriotic Parliament, as I anticipate the approving voice of an indignant people.” (*Cheering.*)

The Attorney-General asked the House to descend from the lofty flights of Mr. Whiteside’s vivid rhetoric to the sober domain of fact and reality. The question, he said, rested upon a simple statement of facts, and it was upon such a statement he called for the complete acquittal of the Government. Declining to follow Mr. Whiteside into extraneous topics, he described the deplorable condition of the Turkish army in Asia when General Williams arrived as Commissioner, and the measures taken by that officer, who received, he said, the fullest instructions from Lord Clarendon, and, if he had no authority from the Ottoman Court, that was no fault of the British Government. So far as regarded his efforts with the Turkish authorities, no blame was imputable to Lord Stratford de Redcliffe; and although he (the Attorney-General) could not defend the serious omissions of

which he had been guilty with reference to General Williams, he asked whether the House was prepared to censure Her Majesty's Government because Lord Clarendon did not think it right or expedient, under the circumstances; to recall that distinguished diplomatist. He gave a short history of the transactions at Kars and Erzeroum, and of the communications between Lord Clarendon, Lord Stratford, General Williams, and the Turkish authorities on the subject of the defence of Armenia and Asiatic Turkey. He pointed out the difficulties in the way of an expedition to the coast of Circassia; when, however, the Sultan consented to the Turkish force at Eupatoria being employed in such an expedition, our Government acceded to the proposal; but as the safety of the Crimean army might be compromised by their removal, it became necessary to obtain the concurrence of the French Government. Conditions were annexed to this concurrence; unavoidable obstacles and delays were interposed in consequence of these conditions, but this Government was not responsible for those delays. Had they taken upon themselves to order the Turkish troops to leave Eupatoria, and a disaster had occurred, how could they have justified their conduct? The real question, he observed, was, what the British Government could have done to avert the fall of Kars, which they had not done? Could the Allies be held responsible for that event, especially when there was a force in Turkish Armenia sufficient to preserve Kars if the Ottoman commanders had done their duty? Because there was a difference of opinion among military men as to the plans for

the relief of its garrison, were Her Majesty's Ministers to be censured? The objects of the war had been achieved; an honourable peace had been obtained, and the country was too just and too generous to seize upon one little dark spot, and on that account to brand their conduct with censure.

Lord J. Manners, in replying to the Attorney-General, contended that the fall of Kars could be attributed only to the conduct of Her Majesty's Ministers; that from the moment when the Governments of France and England became deeply impressed with the importance of that fortress, Lord Stratford was in no degree implicated in the disaster; and that, had his advice been followed, Kars would not have fallen. No other cause could, he said, be assigned for the occurrence than this,—that Lord Panmure directed our War Department, and Lord Clarendon our foreign relations. He argued that if Omar Pasha had been permitted to enter upon the expedition when he first proposed it, Kars would have been relieved, and that, after the French Government had given its consent to the expedition, unnecessary delays had been created by our own. The Attorney-General had insisted that the Government had done all that they could do; but what, Lord John asked, were despatches worth? They sent advice, but they sent neither men, money, nor materials, and they refused every proposal.

The Lord-Advocate said, the resolution proposed by Mr. White-side was open to this objection,—that it was not true that the disaster of Kars arose chiefly from want of foresight and energy on the part of the British Government. Lord Stratford, it was said,

did not give General Williams the support he should have given. It was true that he omitted to answer the General's letters; but was there anything Lord Stratford should have done which he did not do? His silence had nothing to do with the fall of Kars? Reviewing the plans for the relief of that place which had been rejected, the Lord-Advocate pointed out the objections to each, and he appealed to the testimony of Dr. Sandwith, that one cause of Kars not being relieved was that Omar Pasha chose the route he did; the proper route, according to the defenders of Kars themselves, was that suggested by the British Government. Had the Government not shown promptitude and energy, the consequences might have been the defeat of Omar Pasha in his Georgian expedition, and that Sebastopol might not have been taken.

The debate was adjourned to the following day on the motion of Mr. J. G. Phillimore, by whom it was then resumed. It had not, however, the same degree of interest as the discussion of the preceding evening. The substance of Mr. Phillimore's speech was a vindication of the zeal and diligence of Lord Clarendon and a condemnation of Lord Stratford. Mr. Phillimore had himself given notice of an amendment to the effect that a Select Committee should be appointed to inquire into the conduct of Lord Stratford; but as he would not stand between the Ministers of the Crown and the majority, which, if the House was not transported by party violence beyond the bounds of reason they had a right to expect, he declined to move his amendment.

The next speaker was Mr. Ker

Seymer, who picturing himself as undertaking the thankless task of interposing between two parties drawn up in hostile array, to persuade them to return home without finishing the battle, produced an amendment to the effect "that it was not expedient to offer any judgment as to the causes and the consequences of the capitulation of the fortress till the House had an opportunity of considering the terms of the Treaty of Peace and the Protocols of the Conferences recently held at Paris." Since the original motion had been announced, he observed, considerable changes had taken place; the Treaty of Peace and the Protocols had been laid upon the table of the House, and a larger question was now before it—namely, the effect of the fall of Kars upon the Peace Conferences. That event might have enabled Russia to treat for the cession of captured places on the footing of an exchange, but it might also turn out that it had had an important effect upon the peace, and that we had obtained on that account worse terms. He asked whether such an overwhelming case had been made out against Her Majesty's Government as to induce the House, before it knew the real effect of the fall of Kars, upon the Conferences, to rush to the conclusion of a vote of censure.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer could not support the amendment, which merely postponed the question. The Government were desirous that the question should be fully discussed and sifted. With respect to Mr. Whiteside's speech, it was wholly irrelevant. In the first place, nothing could be more remote from truth, or at variance with fact, than to assert that the English Government were respon-

sible for the defence or fall of Kars. By sending a commissioner into Armenia, they did not render themselves responsible for the operations of the army or its failures. Although he acknowledged that the English Government did regard the operations in Asia Minor as of some importance, yet they were felt to be inferior to the capture of Sebastopol, the real object of the war; and to have withdrawn troops from before Sebastopol to secure a merely secondary object (the safety of Kars) would have been highly impolitic in a strategical point of view; and as to the political point of view, the fall of Kars had been utterly without influence on the Treaty of Peace. With respect to the application of the Turkish loan to its proper objects, Sir G. C. Lewis denied that any unnecessary delay had taken place on the part of the Allies. The loan was contracted on the 20th August, and 500,000*l.* had left this country by the 15th September, and on the 24th of October a meeting of the commissioners took place at Constantinople, when a memorandum arranging the securities to be given by the Turkish Government for the application of the loan solely to the purposes of the war was discussed. The Turkish Government declined to promise any detailed account of the expenditure of the moneys. The discussion was adjourned, the money remained locked up in Constantinople, and the commissioners did not meet again till the 24th November,—the day Kars fell,—and it was not until January that the memorandum, after many modifications, was ultimately agreed to. He declined to accept Mr. Seymour's amendment, because it gave the go-by to

Mr. Whiteside's motion—a motion which ministers felt it their duty to meet. They courted a decision on the motion as originally made, confident in an acquittal.

Sir John Pakington was surprised at the extraordinary line taken by Sir G. C. Lewis. He had laboured to prove that the capture of Kars had no influence upon the terms of the peace; but he would find it difficult to persuade the House and the country that the terms had not been influenced by that disaster. His avowal that the Government were in no degree responsible for the defence of Kars was denied by every line in the Blue-book, and by the instructions given to General Williams by Lord Clarendon, which contradicted that statement, and showed that the Government did make themselves responsible, in a very great degree, for the defence of Kars, which, with Erzeroum, was a frontier town of the highest military importance, the very key of the Bosphorus on the Asiatic side. He should not attempt, he said, to vindicate the conduct of Lord Stratford in neglecting General Williams, whose power and usefulness had been thereby very much impaired; but, at the same time, he was bound to deny that the conduct of the ambassador towards the general, though reprehensible, had any material effect in causing the fall of Kars, which he attributed to the subsequent conduct—the vacillation and want of vigour and of prudence—of Her Majesty's Government. Lord Clarendon's despatch of the 13th July, rejecting the organised plan of the Porte to despatch 36,000 effective men to create a powerful diversion in Georgia by Kutais, predicted also that in case of such an expedition

for the relief of Kars by Redout-Kaleh being attempted, the Turkish troops would "fall ill between Redout-Kaleh and Kutais, and be defeated between Kutais and Tiflis." Besides assuming dangers to exist of which there was no proof, the despatch was written in a tone the most discouraging, and the most certain to damp the spirit of the Turks, and was one of which the Government ought really to be ashamed. To this despatch Lord Stratford replies (30th July, 1855) that "a most serious dilemma" is the result of the unfavourable judgment passed by Her Majesty's Government upon the Porte's plan for the relief of Kars. Two months were wasted in doubt and uncertainty, when a diversion was at last allowed to be made by way of Georgia. How then was it possible in the face of these two letters and the ultimate diversion made by way of Georgia, to deny the responsibility of the Government with respect to the measures adopted for the relief of Kars? "After having distinctly taken upon themselves the responsibility of refusing to adopt the proposition made by the Porte, I cannot understand how the right honourable gentleman can defend himself and the Government by saying that they were not responsible for the defence of Kars, and that it was altogether a Turkish affair. There is only one other point to which I will advert. It is the answer of Lord Panmure to General Vivian, dated the 14th of July, 1855, who, in speaking of this plan, calls it a wild and ill-digested plan. He says—'I place such full reliance on your professional ability that I feel no anxiety lest you should undertake any expedition of a nature so wild and ill-digested as that con-

templated by the Porte.' Is the House aware that at the very time Lord Panmure was writing this despatch to General Vivian that gallant general was writing home a letter, in which he says—'I don't entertain a doubt of the advantage of the proposed measure, provided it can be efficiently arranged'?" ("Hear, hear!")

Mr. Layard held, that although the Government were to blame in some matters, yet it was unfair to attribute the loss of Kars solely to them. Reminding the House that he had frequently called their attention to the importance of operations in Asia Minor, he said that no one except Lord Ellenborough supported him. Why did not Mr. Whiteside make his speech on the perilous state of things in Asia Minor two years ago? His desire seemed to be rather to beat the Government than to beat the Russians. His attack was directed against Lord Palmerston, whereas all the misconduct took place before Lord Aberdeen retired from office. Lord Aberdeen did not take precautions to defend the frontier of Asia Minor when the war broke out, and he ought to bear the responsibility. Mr. Layard then made a qualified defence of Lord Stratford; and this seems to have excited Mr. Maguire, who amused the House for some time by the energetic way in which he expressed his "scorn, indignation, and disgust" at Lord Stratford's proceedings; and the equally unequivocal denunciation he applied to the Turkish Pashas and officers—"the most atrocious miscreants that ever polluted the earth with their presence, drunkards, traitors, robbers, blackguards—everything that is abominable under the sun."

Sir William Heathcote was inclined to adopt the amendment of Mr. Seymour; but the Ministry, by refusing to accept it, drove him into a corner, and he should be compelled to vote with Mr. White-side.

After speeches from Mr. Warner and Serjeant Shee in defence of the Government, the adjournment of the debate was moved by Sir Edward Buller Lytton. This was opposed by Lord Palmerston, but after a division rejected, and the debate was adjourned to the 1st of May, when it was resumed by Sir Edward, who, in supporting the original motion, said he should confine himself to a fair reply to the arguments employed on the other side of the House. Admitting, as he did, the ability of Lord Clarendon's despatches, and Turkish mal-administration, there was, he contended, one fault attributable to the British Government from which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had vainly endeavoured to free them; if a moderate sum had been placed at the disposal of General Williams, a fortress acknowledged to be the key of Asia Minor, which had been conquered, not by force, but by famine, would have been saved. In other respects, he argued that the disaster was to be traced to a deficiency of energy and foresight in the Government; they had left the general to the consequences of the corrupt system of which they were aware, and when an army was to be sent to his aid were astute in discovering objections in respect to the route, and perplexed the operations by conflicting orders. When he was asked what was the Government to do, he asked in return what had they done? If he admitted that they could not have written better, he insisted that they

could not have acted worse. There might be other causes for the surrender of Kars, but the main fault rested with the Minister of War.

Mr. Vernon Smith complimented Sir B. Lytton upon the moderate tone of his speech. He insisted that the Government were not to blame for the fall of Kars, which was one of those accidents of war difficult to guard against. Russia had nothing to pride herself upon in the way of triumph, for Kars had fallen by famine and not by force of arms.

Captain Laffan argued against, and Colonel Dunne in favour of, the motion.

Mr. Liddell supported the amendment.

Sir James Graham assumed the substance of the blame imputed to Government to be—first, having reason to be dissatisfied with the conduct of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, they failed to recall him; and, secondly, having omitted to send timely aid to Kars. He agreed with the Attorney-General that the conduct of Lord Stratford had been reprehensible, and that the misunderstanding between him and General Williams was not conducive to the good of the service; but, on the other hand, the past life and the great services of Lord Stratford must be remembered. With regard to the other point, there could be no doubt that there was an indisposition on the part of the French Government to diminish the force in the Crimea until the capture of Sebastopol was secured; and, although he did not say, nor would the Treasury bench maintain, that no error had been committed, in a situation of danger and difficulty, it would be a bold measure on the part of the House of Commons, after the result, to cen-

sure the Government for an exercise of discretion. With respect to pecuniary assistance, he must say some blame did attach to the Government. He thought that if a credit had been opened in favour of General Williams, either with the Ambassador or with the Treasury in England, to the amount of 100,000*l.* or 200,000*l.*, it would have amply supplied Kars with all the necessary provisions. He thought likewise that Omar Pasha might have been allowed to withdraw the Turkish veterans, and that their place might have been supplied with the Turkish Contingent. There was another point: with every desire to maintain the French alliance in its full integrity, he thought too much had, not unnaturally, been conceded to objections not well founded. He came now to the vote he should give. If the previous question had been moved, he did not know that he should not have voted for it; but he could not regard the amendment, which asked merely for delay, in that light. He could not consider the motion as an abstract question—if it were, he could not vote for it; but it must be looked at with reference to circumstances and to time. All the principal objects of the war had been fully achieved, and it would be ungenerous to the Administration, in such circumstances and at that time, to declare them unworthy altogether of the confidence of their countrymen, and that they had failed in foresight and energy. He should, therefore, not vote for the amendment, and he should give his negative to the original motion.

Mr. Disraeli, after vindicating the title of the fate of Kars to the consideration of the House, and repelling the charge that the mo-

tion was the offspring of factious motives, demurred to the statement of the questions put by Sir James Graham. He did not consider that the conduct of the Ambassador constituted a moiety of it. An attempt had been made, before the blue-book appeared, to represent Lord Stratford de Redcliffe as the cause of the disaster; but, although he (Mr. Disraeli) did not vindicate his conduct with regard to Commissioner Williams, the motion did not bring it before the House to be branded by its verdict. Mr. White-side, acting upon a constitutional principle, said to the Government, "If Lord Stratford sinned so grievously you did not recall him, and you are therefore responsible for his conduct." Admitting the conduct of Lord Stratford to be what it was alleged to be, the present Administration found General Williams in a satisfactory position in respect to authority, and what did they do for him? Did they assist him with men? Russia had all at stake at Sebastopol, yet she could defend the Crimea, and at the same time invade Asia Minor, while the English Government, with all the resources of this country at their command, could not send 18,000 or 20,000 men to aid General Williams. But if they did not send men, did they send money? Not a single piastre. Was all the money wanted at Sebastopol? A Turkish loan had been raised; what was done with that money? Not a piastre went to Kars. If it was not furnished to Turkey in time, why was not the loan proposed before? But what need of a loan? The Cabinet might have subscribed the money. The present Administration had pledged themselves to conduct the war with vigour; had they done so? Where

was their foresight or their energy proved? General Williams told the Government on the 5th of March what was wanting to save Kars. How did they treat the request? It was tossed from office to office. Was that energy? In July the War Minister assured the House of Lords that Turkey was able to protect herself. Was that foresight? With respect to the motion, which was justified, he said, by the concessions of the Ministers themselves, it had been brought forward at the desire and with the concurrence of all who acted with Mr. Whiteside in public life.

Lord John Russell pointed out, that the moment to make this motion had been chosen with singular infelicity. If the war had gone on it might have been said that Turkey in Asia was endangered by the loss of Kars; but in a few weeks Kars would again bear the flag of Turkey. Or it might be said that the loss of Kars was injurious to the negotiations; but Mr. Whiteside did not follow Lord Malmesbury's example, and wait for the treaty to see if it bore testimony to his opinion; he brought on the motion the very day the treaty was laid before the House! On the whole, Lord John thought the objects of the war had been attained. Lord Aberdeen's Government had decided that the mode of obtaining those objects was by an expedition to the Crimea; and the Governments of France and England determined to encounter any risk rather than allow that expedition to fail. He heard with astonishment the doctrine of Mr. Disraeli that the Government could obtain men to send to Asia; because he remembered, that "after every means of pressure had been em-

ployed, we were only able to send just a sufficient number of troops to the Crimea to hold the lines at Sebastopol." Lord Aberdeen's Government proposed to raise a foreign legion; who used language that prevented them from doing so? Lord Derby, Lord Ellenborough, Mr. Disraeli, and his friends! It was no doubt desirable to send money to Turkey; but who were foremost in refusing the Turkish loan? "The right honourable gentleman and his friends." Mr. Disraeli, because it suited his purpose, said that Lord John resigned because he objected to the mode of conducting the war in Asia. Mr. Disraeli's memory might, as he said, have become weaker, but certainly his imagination had become stronger. Why Lord John resigned, was because he did not feel justified in opposing Mr. Roebuck's motion.

Lord Palmerston reproached Mr. Whiteside with attempting to show that the object of the war was to defend India against a Russian attack; whereas we had entered into the war, he asserted, for European interests alone, totally unconnected with those of our colonies. The main part of his speech, however, Lord Palmerston observed, was devoted to a vituperation of Lord Stratford. He lamented that the Ambassador, through a pressure of business, should have omitted to answer the letters of General Williams; but he had done everything which our Ambassador at Constantinople could do, and being the fittest man for the position he occupied, a Government which recalled him on the ground of such omission, though it might boast of its energy, would not be praised for its foresight. The chief charge against the Go-

vernment was, he observed, that they did not send men and money to General Williams. But it was a total misrepresentation to say that we undertook to carry on the war in Asia. The Administration of Lord Aberdeen decided, and wisely, that in a war with Russia for the defence of Turkey the part to strike at was Sebastopol, the great centre of the Russian power as aggressive against Turkey, and that it was futile to assail its extremities. The real cause of the fall of Kars was the want of provisions and of a relieving force, and the cause of the want of provisions was the misconduct of the Pasha of Erzeroum, who had sufficient money to purchase an adequate supply of provisions for Kars, but who omitted to pay the carriers, and the supplies fell into the hands of the Russians. In justifying the route for the relief of Kars chosen by the Government, Lord Palmerston pointed out its comparative facilities, observing that it was not only calculated to turn to account the forces of Omar Pasha, but had this advantage—that if the expedition failed in relieving Kars, it would provide for the supply and defence of Erzeroum. In reply to the objection that the Turkish Contingent should have been employed in the expedition, he insisted that it would have been madness to expose raw troops against a Russian force, either at Redout-Kaleh or in the Crimea, and that the Government were right in upholding the decision of the generals, who declined to allow any of their troops to be taken from Sebastopol before it fell. He was willing, he said, to admit that the course of the Opposition during the war had been most creditable to themselves, and

in accordance with the general feeling of the country; but in this motion they had chosen a moment when a war which had been conducted with admirable energy had been brought to a close to propose a vote of censure on the Government—a vote which was not more at variance with the general feeling of the country than the division of that night would show it was at variance with the general opinion of the House of Commons.

Mr. Whiteside then made an energetic reply, after which the House divided, when Mr. K. Seymour's amendment was negatived by 451 to 52; and upon a second division the motion of Mr. Whiteside was lost by 303 to 176, a result which was received with enthusiastic cheering from the Ministerial benches.

In consideration of his distinguished and brilliant services at Kars, a baronetcy with a pension of 1000*l.* per annum was conferred upon General Williams, and on the 9th of May both Houses of Parliament were occupied in the consideration of Her Majesty's Message recommending the grant of the pension. In the House of Lords, Earl Granville moved the Address. In the Commons, the Mover was Lord Palmerston, and the Seconder Sir John Pakington. Lord Granville, in the course of his speech, mentioned some of the leading facts in the life of General Williams, who, he said, was placed in the Artillery Academy at Woolwich by the late Duke of Kent; was afterwards employed as an officer of Engineers in Ceylon for a period of nine years, and in 1843 was sent as commissioner to examine the boundary between Turkey and Persia; he was then selected to instruct the Turkish troops in the

use of artillery. From his intimate knowledge of the country he was appointed by Lord Clarendon, at the beginning of the war, to act as English Commissioner with the Turkish army in Asia Minor. What he had proved himself in this situation was well known. He had not had the opportunity of showing whether he had the ability of a great general in manœuvring large masses of troops, but every other quality of a great commander he had certainly exhibited during the siege of Kars. Earl Granville then spoke in the highest terms of praise of General Williams's companions in labour and peril, Colonel Lake, Major Teesdale, Dr. Sandwith, and General Kmety; he mentioned the last-named officer because he would receive no meed of praise in his own country.

The Addresses were agreed to in both Houses.

The public expectations as to the result of a naval campaign in the Baltic had been highly excited by the very popular appointment of Sir Charles Napier to command the fleet, but the event had failed to realise the hopes thus raised; and the dissatisfaction consequently expressed on all hands by the public and the press was proportionately loud and universal. This feeling had probably as little foundation in reason and fairness as the original exaggerated anticipations; but at all events it had been to a considerable extent confirmed and encouraged by the conduct of the Government, and especially of Sir James Graham towards the Admiral subsequent to his return. Having been chosen to represent the metropolitan borough of Lambeth in Parliament, Sir Charles, on the 13th of March,

in his place in Parliament, moved for a Select Committee to inquire into the operation of the British fleet in the Baltic in the years 1854 and 1855, and took that opportunity of entering into a lengthened explanation of his conduct while in command of the fleet during the former year; he adverted to the circumstances connected with his appointment to the command of that fleet in 1854, to the condition of the fleet at that time, to the expectations raised as to the result of the expedition, and to the difficulties experienced at the outset from the want of pilots and from the improper manning of the ships. He then plunged at once into the correspondence betwixt the Admiralty and himself when he arrived at the scene of operations, connecting the letters by a narrative of his proceedings and of the perils of the navigation in the Gulf of Finland. Some of the letters he admitted were marked "private;" but he justified the reading of them, as they related to matters connected with the public service, and were necessary for his defence. He described the fortifications and approaches of Cronstadt as most formidable, and the instructions he received with reference to this fortress and to Sweaborg as embarrassing. He gave the details of the joint attack upon Bomarsund, assigning reasons why this attack was delayed until the arrival of the French troops. Up to this time, he observed (appealing to the letters he read), every act performed by him had been approved by the Admiralty. He then discussed the vexed question as to the expediency of attacking Sweaborg, representing the difficulties of such an enterprise at

that time, and the conflict of opinions on the question, contrasting the sudden impatience of Sir James Graham for an immediate attack upon that place with his previous caution against confronting stone walls, and insisting that, a commotion having been got up in the country, Sir James had turned round to see whom he could blame, and had fixed upon him (Sir Charles) as a scapegoat. He expatiated at much length upon this part of the subject, and upon the plans he had submitted to the Admiralty for the attack of Sweaborg, criticising, as he went on, the comments made upon his proceedings by the Board, whom he accused of endeavouring to goad him on to an undertaking which, he maintained, would have been, under the circumstances, an act of pure insanity—namely, the attack of Sweaborg and Helsingfors with great ships only, especially at that late season of the year. From the letters of the then First Lord of the Admiralty, first dissuading then urging this attack, it appeared to him, he said, that he was never serious in the Russian war. Having completed the narrative of his proceedings in 1854, down to the period of his being ordered to haul down his flag, Sir Charles briefly reviewed the transactions in the Baltic in 1855, strongly censuring the conduct of the Government with reference to these transactions, as evincing worse than neglect on their part. The only way to get at the truth in these matters, he said, was by granting a Select Committee.

After a pause, during which it seemed likely that the motion would fall to the ground for the want of a seconder, Admiral Walcott

took upon himself that office, saying, that he would “never see a brother officer adrift without throwing a tow-rope to him.” He took up an intermediate position, blaming both Sir Charles Napier and Sir James Graham.

Sir C. Wood remarked upon the impropriety of the course adopted by Sir C. Napier in reading extracts of private and confidential letters, which must put an end to such correspondence, and thereby prejudice the public service. He entirely disapproved of the motion. It was unprecedented and mischievous. It was a question upon which the House ought not to be called on to interfere. It would be inconsistent with the good of the service; and he contended that Sir Charles Napier had not shown the slightest ground for appealing to the House from the judgment of his superior officers—the Board of Admiralty.

Sir James Graham said he would, if it had been consistent with the public service, gladly have confronted Sir Charles Napier before a Select Committee. He had been accused of political cowardice, of writing letters so jesuitical that the honour of an officer was not safe in his hands, and of having treasonably conducted the war, so that the Emperor Nicholas might as well have been at the head of the Admiralty. To support these charges, Sir Charles Napier had laid before Mr. Grant, the editor of the *Morning Advertiser*, private correspondence, on the strength of which Mr. Grant wrote to Mr. Ironside, of the *Sheffield Free Press*, “These letters would suffice, with other facts of undoubted accuracy, to convict Sir James Graham of treason,” and Sir Charles Napier wrote

to Mr. Ironside, "Mr. Grant has told you the truth."

Thus accused, Sir James asked Sir Charles's permission to read the private correspondence comprising Sir Charles's answers to himself. ["Use everything you like," answered Sir Charles Napier.] Sir James accordingly made a statement derived entirely from Sir Charles's letters, and presenting ludicrous contradictions of his published assertions. Very early in February, Sir Charles pressed for the appointment to the Baltic fleet. When appointed, on the 23rd February his conversation left a painful impression that he was dissatisfied with the fitting-out and manning of the fleet; but on the 24th he said he should not decline any service "be it ever so desperate." In a book entitled "*The Navy*," published in 1831, Sir Charles Napier wrote—"The generality of men of 60 years of age are not fit for captains;" they are too old for dash. "Nelson," wrote Sir Charles to Mr. Hume in 1837, "was killed at forty-seven;" and "there is a great difference between the command of a fleet, and a seat in the House of Commons." Sir Charles having passed the age of sixty, "so dangerous to the public service," Sir James did hesitate to appoint the gallant Admiral. When Sir Charles was first urged to enter the Baltic, he more than once represented that the force was inadequate, and he had demanded a compulsory press of sailors. In the Baltic, he declared certain officers unfit to be captains of ships, and wanted to signal them in the presence of the fleet—"Go home; you are no use to me here,"—officers whom he had since publicly declared to be first-rate. On the 30th of May, he declared Swea-

borg to be unattackable either by land or sea; on the 12th of June he was within eight miles, but did not even then reconnoitre; on the 23rd August, General Jones reconnoitred, and reported it possible to destroy the place with 5000 men; subsequently, Marshal Baraguay d'Hilliers and General Niel thought that it might be destroyed without the land-force; and having at last reconnoitred the place, on the 23rd of September Sir Charles admitted the practicability of an attack. If he had made that report early in the summer, the means he desiderated might have been sent out. He now said that Bomarsund might have been taken with 2000 men. In June 1854, he twice wrote, saying that it might be done with 10,000 men. On the 8th of January, 1856, he wrote to the *Times*, saying that he had served 15 years last war, and that it was never the custom for ships to approach batteries at all: in his own account of the attack on Acre, he says—"I had frequently been engaged with batteries last war," and he sketches "the system he had always been accustomed to." Ships might attack the castle and defences of Vera Cruz, he says, "if the attack were made"—with what? "with boldness." "Few naval officers know what ships can do against stone walls." In conclusion, Sir J. Graham said he had been called a friend of Russia, but if treason was charged against him, the matter ought not to stop there.

Sir M. F. Berkeley, in defending the Admiralty, retaliated very severely upon Sir C. Napier, imputing to him, from his own personal observation, mismanagement at Acre, and the utterance of sentiments upon the hustings which

might have caused his removal from the list of Admirals. He accused him of want of decision, firmness, and discretion, observing that a man who could not govern himself was not fit to govern others.

Captain Scobell complained of these personalities, and defended Sir Charles Napier.

Mr. W. Lindsay pointed out the inconsistency of Sir M. F. Berkeley in concurring in the appointment of Sir C. Napier, of whose unfitness he professed to be cognizant.

Mr. Malins joined in this sentiment, thinking that both Sir J. Graham and Sir M. Berkeley were open to the reproach of appointing an officer to a high command for which they acknowledged they knew at the time he was not fit. "It must still be fresh in the memory of many hon. members that a year ago the right hon. gentleman, though then, as now, First Naval Lord of the Admiralty, came down to that House and surprised them all by declaring that it had been the proudest object of his own ambition to command the Baltic fleet; but that he felt it to be a duty to his country to withdraw his own claims in favour of the man who was on all hands admitted to possess the highest qualifications for the post." Surely these were inconsistencies that required explanation. Sir James Graham had not explained how he could consistently direct Sir Charles Napier, when the French army and fleet had left, to do single-handed at the end of October that which he had admitted the combined fleets were unequal to undertake in the middle of September.

Great injustice had been done to the gallant Admiral, who had been charged with not making a proper reconnaissance at Sweaborg in May, and with not taking proper measures to destroy that fortress in the autumn of 1854. The best answer to that was, that what the gallant Admiral was blamed for not effecting in October, 1854, was not even achieved in the campaign of 1855.

Mr. Osborne, after defending Sir J. Graham, whose veracity and honour, he said, had been impeached, and Sir M. Berkeley, who had nothing to do with the recommending of Sir C. Napier, observed that if Sir Charles had personally reconnoitred Sweaborg earlier than he did, there would have been time to send out gunboats and mortars for the attack. This was an error in judgment on his part, and he had evinced a want of discretion in ever bringing his case before the public.

Sir C. Napier, in the course of a long reply, justified his use of the private letters of Sir J. Graham, upon the ground that, as his character had been attacked by the Admiralty, and the Admiralty had refused him a court-martial, he had no other means of vindicating himself. He referred to Sir M. F. Berkeley's personal attack, and declared upon his word of honour, that he had never told Admiral Stopford not to attack Acre. Not one of his allegations had been answered by any of the Ministerial speakers. He was content to let his case rest on the letters he had brought forward, and concluded by withdrawing his motion.

CHAPTER II.

The Peace is announced by Lord Palmerston—Debates upon it in both Houses—In the Lords the Address is moved by the Earl of Ellesmere and seconded by Lord Glenelg — Speeches of the Earls of Malmesbury, Clarendon, Derby, Aberdeen, and Grey—Remarks of Earl Granville, the Duke of Argyll, and Lord Campbell—In the Commons Mr. E. Dennison moves, and Mr. H. Herbert seconds, the Address—A Debate ensues, in which Lord J. Manners, Mr. M. Milnes, Mr. Layard, Lord John Russell, Lord C. Hamilton, and Sir C. Wood, take part in the first night—It is continued on the second by Mr. W. S. Lindsay, Mr. R. Phillimore, The Marquis of Granby, Mr. Sidney Herbert, Mr. Drummond, Mr. Bentinck, Mr. S. Fitzgerald, Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Whiteside, Mr. Gladstone and Lord Palmerston—The Address is agreed to—Her Majesty's Answer—Thanks to the Army and Navy are voted by both Houses—In the Lords the Motion is by Lord Panmure, seconded by the Earl of Derby—Observations of the Duke of Cambridge—Earls Cardigan, Granville, and Grey—In the House of Commons Lord Palmerston is the Mover, and Mr. Disraeli the Seconder.

THE House of Commons re-assembled after the Easter recess, on Monday, March the 31st. The Speaker having taken the chair, the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, and proceeded to consider the Civil Service Estimates, when Colonel French complained that no communication had been made to the House relative to the Treaty of Peace, and moved that the chairman reported progress, in order that the first Minister of the Crown might offer some explanations upon the subject; upon which

Lord Palmerston rose and said: "Sir,—I was in the House not three minutes after the half-hour, which is usually the time for notices of motion being given and questions being put. There were notices of motion previous to going into Com-

mittee of Supply, and there were also notices of questions, and I was as much surprised as other members could be to find the House in Committee of Supply at so unusually early an hour. ('Hear!') If I had come down to the House three minutes sooner I should have made a statement which I am quite prepared now to make. ('Hear!') It is a very short one, and will convey no information to the honourable member beyond that which he already possesses. (*A laugh.*) If it be any satisfaction, however, to my honourable friend to be informed officially of that which he already knows individually, I shall have very great pleasure in enlightening his mind. (*A laugh.*) The House is perfectly aware from the *Gazette* that yesterday, at two o'clock, a Treaty of Peace was

signed at Paris. (*Cheers.*) The House will have seen by the announcement in the *Gazette* that it was determined by the Congress that the particular conditions of the treaty should not be made public until the ratifications had been exchanged. And that indeed is the usual course, for it is a mark of obvious deference to the Powers who are parties to the treaty. At the same time, without going into any details of the conditions, the main substance of which is already known to all the world, because it has been embodied in protocols and published in every country in Europe, I may say at least that my conviction is, that that Treaty of Peace will be deemed satisfactory by this country and by Europe. (*Cheers.*) Sir,—it will be found that the objects for which the war was undertaken have been fully accomplished. It will be found that by the stipulations of that treaty the integrity and independence of the Turkish empire will be secured, as far as human arrangements can effect that purpose. (*Cheers.*) It will be found that that treaty is honourable to all the Powers who are contracting parties to it, and I trust that, while, on the one hand, it has put an end to a war which every friend to humanity must naturally have wished to see concluded; on the other hand, it will lay the foundation of a peace which I trust, so far at least as regards the circumstances out of which the war began, will be lasting and enduring. ('Hear, hear!') Sir,—during the negotiations which have led to this peace I am happy to say that the same cordiality which has prevailed among the Allies in carrying on the war has also mainly contributed to the conclusion of peace, and that

we shall leave off at the conclusion of this war in a stricter and closer alliance with them—and in a more extended alliance—than existed during the continuance of the war; and that, therefore, the future permanence not only of a good understanding but of an intimate connection between the great Powers of Europe will have been cemented and strengthened by the communications that have taken place during the negotiations. ('Hear, hear!') Sir, — I have nothing more to say, except that it must be gratifying to the country to know that nothing could exceed the ability with which the British negotiators have performed their arduous and difficult task during the negotiations — (*cheers*)—and that Lord Clarendon and Lord Cowley have not only maintained the honour, dignity, and interests of the country they represented, but by their conciliatory conduct have secured for themselves and their country the respect, esteem, and good-will of those with whom they had to do. (*Cheers.*) The ratifications are to be exchanged as soon as they can be received at Constantinople and St. Petersburg. The limitation of time has been four weeks, but I should hope that at least within three weeks the ratifications will be exchanged at Paris." (*Cheers.*)

Colonel French thereupon withdrew his motion, and the Committee resumed the discussion of the Estimates.

On Monday, May the 5th, the House of Lords was filled to overflowing by an audience eager to hear the debate upon the Treaty of Peace.

The Earl of Ellesmere, in a speech as remarkable for classic grace and elegance of diction as for

good taste and feeling, moved the Address. He dwelt on his own unfitness for the task: on the satisfaction he felt at the terms of peace—a satisfaction without drawback or mitigation. Not such a satisfaction as France might have felt with the bulletins of Ulm or Austerlitz or Jena—that satisfaction he would forego without regret—but a satisfaction derived from the fact that the reward of our exertions and sacrifices had come up to the mark we prescribed for ourselves at the outset, and was in the main all to which reasonable men looked forward. He took pains to show how unjust were those suspicions which represented England as unwilling to make peace, and Lord Clarendon as the bearer of instructions to Paris to make it impossible for other Powers to accept conditions with which they were satisfied. He praised the conduct of Lords Clarendon and Cowley at the peace negotiations, and spoke in high terms of the exertions of our army and navy, and with affectionate regret of Lord Raglan, in the following pathetic and eloquent terms:—“Among those things on which I scarcely trust myself to speak are Lord Raglan’s services and Lord Raglan’s loss. (‘Hear, hear!’) I am the less disposed to regret any restraint I put on myself in this matter because I know that accident has elsewhere afforded occasion to more than one friend and associate of Lord Raglan to do justice, as far as for the moment is possible, necessarily incomplete, but substantial and solid, to his glorious and lamented memory. (*Continued cheering.*) Among those witnesses to character and conservators of that sacred trust—a comrade’s fame—was one who,

VOL. XCVIII.

I say it advisedly, next to Lord Raglan, contributed more than any man living in Her Majesty’s service to the success of the Allied arms and the peace in which we rejoice. I mean Admiral Sir E. Lyons. (‘Hear, hear!’) I well know that if he were standing, as I wish he were, in my place, he would tell your Lordships that through that awful winter of complicated trials, such as no army I ever heard or read of endured and survived, there was one spell which stood between that host and its destruction. That spell was confidence in its leader. (‘Hear, hear!’) From that humble abode, the headquarters of Lord Raglan, there radiated a moral force, a serene and unquenchable spirit of faith, and trust, and duty, which did resist, and which alone could have resisted, the combined influences of weather, privation, and fatigue superadded to the constant changes of a defective military position, threatened in front, flank, and rear by a brave, an able, and outnumbering army. (‘Hear, hear!’) The spell prevailed; not even discomfiture, far less disgrace—for discomfiture and even destruction under such circumstances might have come without disgrace—fell on the banners of England.”

In conclusion, alluding to the unobtrusive heroism and self-devotion of Miss Nightingale, he said:—“My Lords, the agony of that time has become matter of history. The vegetation of two successive springs has obscured the vestiges of Balaclava and Inkermann. Strong voices now answer to the roll-call, and sturdy forms now cluster round the colours. The ranks are full, the hospitals are empty. The angel of mercy still lingers to the last on the scene of her labours—

[D]

(‘hear, hear!’)—but her mission is all but accomplished. Those long arcades of Scutari in which dying men sat up to catch the sound of her footstep or the flutter of her dress, and fell back on the pillow content to have seen her shadow as it passed, are now comparatively deserted. She may probably be thinking how to escape, as best she may, on her return, the demonstrations of a nation’s appreciation of the deeds and motives of Florence Nightingale. (‘Hear, hear!’) I am sure that from Balaclava and Kadikoi to the ravine of the Tchernaya and the heights of Inkermann, while England’s renovated battalions are shaking the earth with their tramp and extorting alike from constant allies and former foes that ungrudging admiration which true soldiers love to feel even for ‘foemen worthy of their steel’—amid that pomp and circumstance of war’s display without its terrors, and the interchange of hospitalities between reconciled antagonists, *surgit amari aliquid*—(‘Hear, hear!’)—there will be a bunch of myrrh in the festival goblet when the cup is fullest and the revel is at its height, which will make the draught bitter but wholesome. (‘Hear, hear!’) There will be a thought and a sigh for one who should have been there. They will miss among the crowds of officers of many nations the armless sleeve, the noble form, which in the hour of battle they had never far to seek—that countenance which by its winning expression was in itself a passport to the soldier’s heart. (‘Hear, hear!’) Yes, there will be a thought and a sigh for him who established and maintained the footing of England on that soil, and but for whom,

as I devoutly believe, the graves on Cathcart’s Hill would have been now, like the *tumuli* which record in that country the reign of extinct dynasties and forgotten sovereigns, the sole memorial of the achievements and the fate of an English army.” (*Cheers.*) The noble Lord concluded by moving,—

“That a humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, to return to Her Majesty the sincere acknowledgments and thanks of this House for the important communication which Her Majesty has been graciously pleased to make to this House, of the general treaty concluded at Paris on the 30th of March, between Her Majesty, the Emperor of Austria, the Emperor of the French, the King of Prussia, the Emperor of Russia, the King of Sardinia, and the Sultan, by which peace has been re-established between Her Majesty, the Emperor of the French, the King of Sardinia, and the Sultan, on the one hand, and the Emperor of Russia on the other;

“To assure Her Majesty that, while we should have deemed it our duty cheerfully to afford Her Majesty our firm support if it had unfortunately been found necessary to continue the war, we have learnt with joy and satisfaction that Her Majesty has been enabled to re-establish peace on conditions honourable to Her Majesty’s crown, and which fully accomplish the great objects for which the war was undertaken;

“To express to Her Majesty the great satisfaction which we feel at finding that while those alliances which have so mainly contributed to the vigorous and successful prosecution of the war have been equally effective in the consolidation of peace, Powers which have

not taken an active part in the war have combined with the belligerents to give additional firmness to the arrangements by which the repose of Europe is in future to be protected from disturbance;

“To state to Her Majesty that we rejoice that, notwithstanding the great exertions which the late war has rendered necessary, the resources of the empire remain unimpaired;

“To express our hope that the peace which has now been concluded may, under the favour of Divine Providence, long continue to shed its blessings over Europe, and that harmony among Governments and friendly intercourse among nations may steadily promote the progress of civilisation and secure the welfare and happiness of mankind.”

Lord Glenelg seconded the motion. If they compared the position of Russia in the Baltic and Black Sea before the war with that she occupied at present, they must admit that the objects of that war had been gained. Before the commencement of hostilities Russia was threatening Norway and Sweden, she held a protectorate of the Principalities, and in Sebastopol she kept a standing menace over the Ottoman Empire; now Sebastopol was destroyed, the protectorate no longer existed, the Black Sea was opened; while Sweden was secured from aggression. The terms of the treaty were moderate, and would prove that England had no desire of self-aggrandisement; the conditions of the treaty obtained advantages for all Europe; they belonged to the world; the nation was indebted to the Ministers by whom it had been concluded, and more especially to the ability, character, and conduct

of Lord Clarendon. The events of the war had shown that, though devoted to the arts of peace, England had not lost, in luxury and wealth, the qualities which had made her eminent in war; some few might have hesitated and doubted, but throughout the contest the spirit of the nation had never wavered.

The Earl of Malmesbury began by remarking that it was time they should hear something of the treaty they were invited to discuss; for although two eloquent speeches had been delivered, he doubted whether any one of their Lordships knew any more about the treaty than he did when he entered the House. He was unwilling to raise the smallest objection; but Her Majesty's Government had made use of such exaggerated language that he could not concur in it. He did not think the treaty would warrant them in expressing “joy,” or even “satisfaction;” and he should propose to leave out all the words of the second paragraph after the word “learnt,” and to substitute these—“That Her Majesty has been enabled to re-establish peace upon conditions which appear to Her Majesty and her allies adequately to effect the great objects of the war.” Whether he would press that amendment to a division, would depend on the feeling manifested during the debate. In giving reasons for the course he took, Lord Malmesbury quoted the third and fourth articles of the treaty,—the restitution of Kars by the Russians, and of Sebastopol, Kertch, Yenikale, Kinburn, Balaklava, and Kamiesch by the Allies,—and argued, that the juxtaposition of the two articles proved that Kars was given as an equivalent for Sebastopol and the other Rus-

sian towns. It was even stated in the protocols that Lord Cowley had objected to the conjunction of the two articles, because it would appear as if the belligerents were making an exchange; but he was "repressed and suppressed." Nor was it only all the towns mentioned above that had been given in exchange for Kars. Russia was allowed to resume possession of the Circassian coast, and to rebuild the forts there. "In plain English, my Lords, we have deserted the Circassians." We begged their assistance; we benefited from it to a great extent—(*an ironical cheer from Lord Panmure*)—why, it was the inroad of Schamyl upon Tiflis that compelled the Russian army to retreat when about to enter Anatolia in 1854. No wonder the Government deserted the Circassians, when they thus forgot their obligations. He questioned the safety of the arrangements for making the Black Sea a neutral sea. Russia could only maintain there six ships of war; but she might build transports of 1000 or 3000 tons, keep them in the impregnable harbour of Sebastopol, arm them, and send them forth with troops at pleasure to assail the Turkish coast. Referring to the discussion in the protocols on Nicolaieff, he pointed out that there was nothing to prevent Russia from building what ships she pleased there, except the good faith of the present Emperor. The maintenance of the military maritime arsenal of Nicolaieff should have been forbidden, and the fortifications of Sebastopol should have been razed. He severely criticised the alteration made in the portion of Bessarabia to be given up: the portion ceded, he said, bore about the same proportion to the terri-

tory that was to have been ceded as his thumb-nail bore to his arm. Insisting that this was another instance of the influence of the fall of Kars on the negotiations, he confined the remainder of his address to the circumstances attending the fall of that fortress, expressing his disapproval of the conduct of Lord Stratford towards General Williams, and condemning the negligence of Lord Clarendon in not sending another agent with advice and money to General Williams. The conduct of the Ministry in the whole affair, he said, was inexplicable.

The Earl of Clarendon contended that the fall of Kars had no prejudicial effect upon the treaty, and entered at considerable length into explanations of the circumstances which led to that disaster. Referring to the juxtaposition of the third and fourth articles of the treaty, he said it proceeded from a cause which Lord Malmesbury evidently did not understand. The whole of the first articles related to the belligerents, and they were kept distinct. Having in the third and fourth articles provided for the territorial arrangements necessary to complete the peace, the twentieth article, in conformity with the conditions of the Treaty of Vienna, stated that, "in exchange for the towns, ports, and territories enumerated in Article 4 of the present treaty, and in order more fully to secure the freedom of the navigation of the Danube, His Majesty the Emperor of All the Russias consents to the rectification of his frontier in Bessarabia."

Lord Clarendon next explained, that as regarded the transports alluded to by Lord Malmesbury, "it was ultimately arranged that

the conveyance of troops might be secured by ships of war, and that six small ships of 200 tons each would be sufficient." With respect to Nicolaieff, he repeated the explanation in the protocols. Russia was not bound to make any engagement with respect to her inland waters. "But the declaration made by the Russian Plenipotentiaries in the name of their Sovereign, and recorded in a protocol which is signed by them, although it may not have all the binding force of a treaty, has the same moral obligation; and I have no hesitation in saying that if one of those protocols were ever violated, it might be appealed to successfully by all the contracting parties, as a binding document." With regard to the line of frontier, in Bessarabia, an alteration had been made, because the frontier proposed by Austria was not the best frontier. It was doubtful whether any "chain of mountains" existed, and it appeared that the line would intersect some free and prosperous Bulgarian colonies in which the Russian Government took an interest. As regarded the forts on the eastern coast of the Black Sea, Lord Clarendon explained, that as we had not gained any military successes in that quarter, we were not in a position to impose conditions. Either those countries must have been made independent, or they must have been restored to Turkey. It would have been a mockery to make them independent, and they would not have submitted to be restored to Turkey. It was remarkable "that the only period during which there have been no military movements whatever against the Russians on the part of Schamyl and the Circassians

has been the two years of war. They had never shown the slightest sympathy with us, or the least wish to assist our arms. On one occasion, indeed, a chief did engage with the captain of one of Her Majesty's ships to produce 10,000 men at a particular place on a particular day; but when the officer went to receive them he could not find a single man." The forts on the coast were for defence, not aggression. "Count Orloff stated, on the part of the Emperor of Russia, that he hoped the character of the people would be improved by the civilising influence of commerce; that the blockade and other restrictions would be removed; and that all the ports of Russia in that quarter—seven or eight in number—would be opened to foreign trade, and would receive foreign consuls."

Having borne testimony to the good faith and straightforward proceedings of the Emperor of the French, and having pointed out that "his policy had its reward when, on the 30th of March last, the anniversary of the battle of Paris, the representatives of the same Powers who had signed the Treaty of Paris went in a body to the Tuileries to announce to the Emperor Napoleon that they had just signed with France, and not against France, another and a very different Treaty of Paris restoring peace to Europe," Lord Clarendon continued—"I must acknowledge, my Lords, that when I arrived in Paris I became painfully sensible of the existence of a feeling there—produced by the tone adopted in Parliament and the press—that we did not intend to make peace, but to drag France on in a war with us, even after she believed that the objects for which the war

was undertaken had been accomplished. But I must say that the Emperor did not share that feeling. The Emperor knew that what we had undertaken to do we should perform. He believed in the honour of England, and he believed that no British Minister and no British representative would undertake negotiations for the purpose of securing any selfish objects. But, on the other hand, the Emperor well knew that, faithful as we should be to our own engagements, we should, at whatever risk or hazard, insist that engagements should be kept with us." He bore testimony also to the honourable and straightforward conduct of the Russian Plenipotentiaries. "I think," he said in conclusion, "if your Lordships will reflect upon the state of things which existed two years ago,—if you remember the onerous treaties by which Turkey was bound, and which were so interpreted as to give Russia powers of interference in the Ottoman Empire,—if you remember that Russia claimed a protectorate over the civil and religious immunities and privileges of many of the Sultan's subjects; that Sebastopol, protecting a powerful Russian fleet, was a standing menace to Turkey; that Russia claimed a protectorate over the Principalities, and claimed and constantly exercised a power of armed intervention; that she was able to obstruct the free navigation of the Danube; that she was meditating the establishment of another Sebastopol in the Aland Islands; that she was aiming at an occupation of Norway, which would have given her complete command of the Northern Seas,—if you remember that Russia had created and justified the greatest alarm through-

out Europe; and if you reflect that now all the treaties between Russia and Turkey are annulled; that the Sultan has granted reforms, privileges, and immunities to his Christian subjects; that Sebastopol and the Russian fleet are no longer a menace to Turkey; that the seas which were before closed are now open to free and unrestricted commerce; that the Principalities will no longer suffer from Russian protection, or have cause to fear Russian intervention, but that the institutions which, in fact, they will give themselves, will be placed under the guarantee of Europe; that a treaty has been signed, which is annexed to the general treaty, and therefore part of the national law of Europe, which guarantees the possessions of Sweden and Norway from aggression on the part of Russia; that Austria is now more closely bound to the Western Powers by the treaties into which she has entered; that Sardinia has gained great influence and prestige by the position which has been assigned to her in the Congress of the great Powers of Europe; that the alliance between England and France has been strengthened by the war, and that the common sacrifices and hardships which they have borne have cemented the ties of friendship, good-will, and cordiality between the two nations,—I think, my Lords, you will have no reason to be dissatisfied. I think it will be admitted that the objects of the war have been accomplished; and I trust that a treaty which secures those objects may not be thought unworthy of your Lordships' approval. I trust also that the people of this great country—knowing, as they do, that their resources are unexhausted, that their

energies are unimpaired, that they were never at any moment of their history better prepared for war than at the present time—will be content to sheathe the sword with honour, and remember the calamities of war only the better to appreciate the blessings of peace.” (*Loud cheers.*)

The Earl of Derby would not adopt the language of the Address and regard the peace “with joy and satisfaction.” He accepted it, as he believed the country did, without enthusiasm, but without opposition. He did not think it adequate to the sacrifices that had been made, and he hoped it would turn out better than the Peace of Amiens. As to the fall of Kars, he thought the Ministers were more directly to blame for the neglect of General Williams than Lord Stratford. They should have given him both money and authority at once. There was nothing in the treaty to prevent Sebastopol being rebuilt, nothing to secure the neutralisation of the Black Sea, and no obligation imposed upon Russia to build at Nicolaieff only such ships as were agreed upon for service in the Black Sea. As to the forts in the Black Sea and our desertion of the Circassians, they were more important questions of policy than the Government appeared to believe.

“My noble friend says that we could not call upon the Russian Government to demolish these forts. I do not know whether upon the part of the country he had a right to do so, but I know that the British Plenipotentiary did ask for the destruction of these forts, and his request was, to use a mild diplomatic term, “adjourned.” And now he tells us that we had no right to ask anything of the sort,

and could not expect Russia to grant it. As to military success, I do not know what view the noble Earl takes of the subject. Perhaps he is so intoxicated with greater military successes, not unmingled with some disasters and some imperfections, even in the achievement of the greatest operations, as to think that the naval operations upon the eastern coast of the Black Sea by which these forts were destroyed and which caused their abandonment by the Russians, were not such as called upon us to maintain the *status quo*, and to procure that those forts so abandoned and destroyed should not by the same Russians be rebuilt and reoccupied. I will not enter into the question of what degree of support or co-operation we may have received from the Circassians, from Schamyl or any other of their chiefs, nor into the question why we did not receive such support; but I ask, not as a question of gratitude or good feeling towards them, but as a question of policy, and of carrying out that which the noble Lord himself declared to be among the principal objects of the war—the limiting of the territory and the repression of the aggrandisement of Russia—whether he can justify having inserted no conditions in this treaty by which these tribes should be maintained in that degree of independence of Russia which has formed, and might continue to form, an important barrier against the aggressions of that Power in the quarter in which they are most dangerous to Turkey? Your object was to repress the aggressions of Russia and to secure the integrity of Turkey; and you neglect to make provision against the expansion of territory and the

continuance of aggression precisely on the side on which Russia can at any time best carry out her views of aggrandisement against that Turkey, the integrity of which it is your object to secure. I say that that is a signal defect in the treaty. You may say what you like about the indifference to your assistance manifested by those tribes—an indifference occasioned, perhaps, by your injurious interference with their domestic concerns, or by their inability to hold their own; but I say that in providing for the neutralisation of the Black Sea, for the repression of Russian aggression, and for the integrity of Turkey, these Circassian provinces were of all others those to which you ought primarily to have directed your attention, and this you have wholly and indisputably neglected."

The non-settlement of the form of government for the Principalities he contended would open endless causes of dispute. He condemned severely that part of the treaty which entirely changed the maritime code of England without the knowledge and sanction of Parliament, observing:

"The corn laws were repealed after full discussion, with the knowledge and sanction of both Houses of Parliament. But our maritime supremacy has been surrendered (I use the mildest word), has been given away, has been yielded to I know not what. There is no protocol which tells us what were the arguments in its favour. There is no discussion as to the objects to be gained by it. There is no statement whether it was volunteered by the British Minister. But this I know, that, right or wrong, volunteered by the British Minister, or surrendered

by him to the feeling, prejudices, and desires of other countries, it was done in the dark, without the knowledge of Parliament; and that the Minister, sent and trusted by the country to conduct negotiations for restoring peace on certain bases known to the country, took advantage of his position to make an important alteration in the maritime law of England without the knowledge of Parliament, and without our having the least idea that such our birthright was being given away. (*Cheers.*) This question is too large to be argued now, but I should have thought myself unworthy of a seat in your Lordships' House if, while we are discussing the terms of this treaty, I did not advert to the contents of the paper which I have seen with astonishment and indignation forms an adjunct to the treaty, of which it is undoubtedly no part."

Earl Granville made some observations on certain points which Lord Derby had touched, but did not add to the previous remarks of Lord Clarendon. As regarded the declarations on maritime law, he told Lord Derby that the Government would be able to show they had strictly followed the precedent invariably set with respect to treaties or conventions with foreign nations, and that what had been done would not only be a great advantage to mankind, but more particularly to Great Britain.

The Earl of Aberdeen rejoiced that the warlike reputation of Lord Palmerston had rendered it possible to make a peace wise and honourable in itself, "but which, if it had been made under my auspices, might, perhaps, have produced discontent and excited serious reprehension." The treaty was not of the triumphant charac-

ter of that which it was his (Lord Aberdeen's) good fortune to sign in the same capital some 40 years ago ; but it was one which amply fulfilled the objects of the war, and ought therefore to be satisfactory.

He pointed out two objections, however, in detail. What would, he asked, be the operation of the article with respect to the neutralisation of the Black Sea ? He was afraid that it would be found practically impossible. "The clause must either give enormous advantages to Russia, or it must be inapplicable. The Turkish fleet could enter the Black Sea when it pleased ; it would be prevented from doing so merely by the obligation of the treaty ; but if Russia ever had reason to apprehend an attack by the Turkish fleet, and applied to Great Britain, what was to be done ? We must either guarantee her from any such attack, or must allow her to make preparations for her own defence. Either we guaranteed Russia from an attack by the Turks, or our neutralisation came to nothing."

The other objection was, that the Treaty of Paris precluded the contracting Powers from interfering in Turkey with the view of seeing that the Hatti-scheriff was executed. Yet without the constant superintendence of the other Powers, the Hatti-scheriff would not be worth the paper it was written on. While Lord Stratford remained at Constantinople, he would take care to see that the Hatti-scheriff was executed ; but suppose Turkey were to call in Russia to prevent interference with her internal government, would not Russia have a right to oppose our proceedings, as contrary to the treaty of peace ?

Lord Cowley, speaking for the

first time in public, replied to Lord Aberdeen. With regard to his first objection, it was met by the treaty, which provided that if either party violated the treaty, the Allies should assist the party requiring help ; while the parties were bound not to commit any act of aggression without giving the other Powers an opportunity of meeting the difficulty. As regarded the Hatti-scheriff, "it was not the intention of the Congress to limit the power of diplomatic interference, but to prevent the Government of the Sultan from being constantly harassed by foreign applications with regard to the internal affairs of the empire."

Earl Grey was induced to take part in the debate by the observations of Lord Derby on maritime law, from which he utterly dissented. He felt deeply grateful to the Government and the Plenipotentiaries for what he believed to be "one of the greatest advances made for a long course of years in the progress of civilisation and humanity." One other comment he made. He objected to the system of Hatti-scheriffs and to the whole system of European interference in Turkey, which he predicted would inflict more suffering on Christians than the old Turkish laws. The Turkish Government was too weak to enforce the new laws.

"We call upon Turkey to admit her Christian subjects to an equality of rights and privileges with her Mahometan subjects. Now is it possible for any Government to rule with mildness and equality subjects whose affections it does not possess, who regard it with feelings of bitter hostility, and who look forward with anxiety to the time when they may be able to contribute to its overthrow ? Are not

these the feelings of the Christian subjects of the Porte, and were they not manifested during the late war? Was it not solely by the intervention of the British and the French that an insurrection in Servia was prevented? It is impossible, after four hundred years of the most galling tyranny, that any other than the most hostile feeling towards their oppressors can exist in the minds of the Christian population of Turkey; and therefore, I say, that to ask the Government of the Porte to admit this portion of its subjects to an equality of rights and privileges with the Mahometans, is to make a demand upon it which it is not in its power effectually to concede; and it is vain to imagine that the system you seek to establish can ever practically work. This was one of my main objections to the original policy of the war—objections only the more confirmed by all that has since occurred."

The Duke of Argyll differed from Earl Grey with respect to the system of Hatti-scheriffs, and Lord Campbell could not forbear to express his deliberate opinion that the new conventions respecting maritime rights had been agreed to in a strictly constitutional form.

The Address was then put and agreed to.

On the same day in the House of Commons, on the order for taking into consideration the Treaty of Peace, Mr. E. Denison moved the Address to Her Majesty, which was in terms the same as that adopted by the other House of Parliament. It was, he observed, but two short years ago since a communication was made from the Throne to that House, and unanimously responded to,

on the causes of the war, and if at that period any one had predicted the actual results of the contests—the capture of the strong fortress of Sebastopol and 3800 pieces of cannon, the sinking of the Russian Black Sea fleet, the North Seas swept, and all the great objects of the war accomplished—who would not say, he asked, "May these things be, and God's name be praised?" But all these objects, and more, had been attained. The alliance of Sweden with the Western Powers had been secured, and the consent of the Emperor of Russia to the "rectification" (a new term) of his frontier in Bessarabia implied, rather forcibly in his opinion, what strength had been engaged in the contest. The peace he considered to be a good and honourable one, and, although it had not been received with exultation by the country, he believed its joy and satisfaction would increase from day to day.

The motion was seconded by Mr. H. Herbert, who attributed the want of enthusiasm in the country alluded to by Mr. Denison not to any dissatisfaction with the terms of the peace, but to a variety of causes, one of which was a general conviction that, if the war had continued, our army would have added largely to the laurels it had won. The main objects for which we had embarked in the war had, however, been obtained; we had all the guarantees which a treaty could give for the integrity of Turkey. In one of the protocols Russia engaged not to construct large vessels of war at Nicolaieff, and to remove the two vessels of the line now at Nicolaieff to the Baltic; and the rectification of the frontier of Bessarabia entailed the abandonment of the fort of Ismail,

to which Russia once attached vast importance.

Lord J. Manners said he rose, not to oppose the reception of the Address, but to say that he had strong objections to some of its terms. He objected to the assertion that the conditions of the peace “fully accomplished the great objects for which the war was undertaken.” Those objects were—first, the present integrity of the Turkish Empire; and, secondly, the security of its independence and integrity in future. The first object he believed to have been most fully attained; but the second and all-important object had not been secured. That object might be divided into two—the independence and integrity of Turkey in Europe, and in Asia; and the latter—the most important of the two—he contended, had not been carried out in the treaty, there being no security taken against the aggression of Russia upon the Turkish Asiatic provinces, except the poor and pitiful attempt of Lord Clarendon to prevent the re-erection of the Russian forts on the Black Sea. He enlarged upon the importance of those provinces and upon the injustice and dishonour of abandoning the Circassians and the tribes of the Caucasus. Either, he said, the British Government regarded these people as independent, or as dependent upon Russia, and therefore insurgents; but he denied that Europe had ever recognised the right of Russia to Circassia. If this proceeding was so devoid of justice and of honour, where was the policy of handing over these tribes to Russia? An author, now a member of Her Majesty’s Administration (Mr. D. Seymour), had represented the Caucasus as “the real

citadel of Russian power in the East.” Lord Palmerston had acknowledged that there was nothing in the treaty to prevent Russia from re-constructing her forts on the Circassian coast; and could any one doubt with what object they would be re-erected? Lord Clarendon, in the Conferences, had argued that the forts could not be rebuilt, but the Russian Plenipotentiaries maintained the contrary opinion, and the consideration of that point was adjourned. At Vienna it was one of our objects to secure the independence of the Trans-Caucasian tribes; but by the treaty these gallant people were handed over, without pity or remonstrance, to their implacable foe. Referring to the language of Lord Clarendon, in the protocol of the 8th of April, on the subject of the Belgian press, introduced by Count Walewski, he insisted that the manner in which the Earl declined to pledge himself to reactionary and restrictive measures was calculated to give countenance and encouragement to such measures.

Mr. M. Milnes thought that Lord J. Manners had damaged his cause by the spirit of exaggeration which pervaded his speech. He could not believe, he said, that many persons would agree with him that the treaty contained anything dishonourable or degrading to England. The people of this country would find gratification in the conviction that the integrity of Turkey had received a guarantee which had been hardly hoped for. All the fears entertained by Lord J. Manners as to the vengeance which the Circassians would suffer from Russia were, in his opinion, futile. He joined with him, however, in condemning the manner in

which the free Belgian press had been spoken of in the Conferences, amounting, he thought, to a menace, which might have injurious effects.

Mr. Layard was willing to accept the Address, considering that the great objects of the war had been accomplished, so far as intended by Her Majesty's Government who entered into it. He had always been of opinion that the original error was committed by Lord Aberdeen's Government, but when once we had entered into the war it was too late to change our policy. The questions related to the Christians, the Principalities, the navigation of the Danube, and the Russian forts on the Black Sea. With respect to the first, more, he said, had been done than he had expected, and he thought Lord Clarendon had acted wisely when he supported Aali Pasha in not having the firman inserted in the treaty. He thought, however, that the extension of the conscription to non-Mussulman subjects of the Porte was unwise. Upon the whole, he gave credit to the Turkish Government for its liberal policy. In respect to the second question, too, the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia, more had been done than he could have possibly hoped for, and he thought Lord Clarendon had originated a most liberal policy in suggesting the union of the two Principalities, which was opposed by Austria. He rejoiced, also, at the manner in which Servia, a country with a great *avenir*, had been dealt with. As to the Black Sea, he suggested various doubts, and especially in respect to the Circassian coast. Was the blockade to continue, and were we to be excluded, as hitherto, from com-

mercial intercourse with a country the right of Russia to which had never been recognised by any document or declaration? Were our ships and our consuls to be excluded from Sebastopol and Nicolaieff? With regard to the navigation of the Danube, he thought the provisions in the treaty excellent. Upon the whole, he was of opinion that the Government deserved great credit for the treaty, which far exceeded, he said, any reasonable expectations he had formed, and he was bound to thank them for it, as fulfilling all their objects, looking to the principles upon which they embarked in the war.

Lord J. Russell observed that, although Lord John Manners had blamed a few particulars of the treaty, he had neither proposed an amendment nor offered any opposition to the Address; still, as the subject was one of the greatest importance, and the House was now to consider the settlement of a question which for half a century had occupied the minds of men,—and he was afraid might occupy them at a future time,—he could not refrain from offering some observations to the House. His persuasion was that the conditions of the peace were honourable to the Crown, and that they fully accomplished the objects of the war. Taking the articles of the treaty in their order, he said the arrangement under which Russia gave up the protectorate of the Principalities seemed to him to be very efficient for the object. The second point was the navigation of the Danube; and with regard to that he considered that our success at Sebastopol had been taken full advantage of. Russia was now entirely excluded from the naviga-

tion of that river, and a control which had tended to impede its navigation. Upon the third point, which had been the stumbling-block at Vienna, he thought that no greater security could be obtained than by the plan adopted of neutralisation; and with respect to the fourth, the condition of the Christian population of Turkey, he concurred very much with Mr. Layard. Such being his opinion of the articles of the peace, he did not think, he added, that any articles, however framed (and these appeared to have been drawn up with precision and skill), could give a security against aggressions on the part of Russia. It was impossible to say that her projects of ambition might not be renewed. But the policy of our Government had falsified the prediction of the great Napoleon, who said at St. Helena that when Russia developed her designs upon Constantinople, Austria would take part with her, and share in the spoil. We had now this further security, that Austria had entered into a treaty with England and France, guaranteeing the integrity and independence of Turkey, and that any attempt upon her independence and integrity should be made a *casus belli*. He thought, therefore, the House had every reason to be satisfied with what had been done, and if he were told that many people were dissatisfied with the peace, and if he believed, as he did, that Lord Palmerston was quite right in saying that if the war was prolonged greater successes might attend our arms and greater advantages be obtained, he only gave more honour to the Government that, having it in their power to induce the nation to continue the war, yet, being satisfied that its objects were fully

accomplished, it preferred peace. There were, however, some things he might criticise, and which, in his opinion, required explanation. He thought it would have been better if the engagement respecting Nicolaieff had appeared in the treaty than as an answer of Count Orloff in a protocol. With respect to the Circassian forts, he considered that the right of Russia to restore them might be the means of confirming her power in the Black Sea. Lord John then expatiated largely upon the state of Italy, expressing a strong hope that what had been said by Lord Clarendon at the Conferences upon this subject would not be allowed to fall to the ground, otherwise, he observed, if a protest were made against the present state of Italy, and this should be taken up haughtily by Austria, that country might be left in a worse condition than at present.

Lord C. Hamilton addressed himself entirely to the question of Circassia, which he discussed at great length, denying that Russia ever had any valid title to that territory. He insisted it was the duty of this country to interfere and prevent these gallant mountaineers, whom we had not treated as they deserved, from being handed over to Russia. He moved by way of amendment to leave out the words after "conditions," and insert, "which accomplish to a great extent the objects for which the war was undertaken."

Sir C. Wood, after replying to Lord C. Hamilton, denying that we had handed the Circassians over to Russia, since they were left in exactly the same condition as before the war, observed that the stipulation as to the forts on the Black Sea applied to both

Turkey and Russia, and if Russia were required not to reconstruct the forts on the Circassian coast, Turkey should be called upon to demolish Varna. He touched very lightly upon the other points in the treaty, insisting that the arrangements regarding the Black Sea, for its neutralisation and the limitation of the vessels of war in that sea to ten of small size, were infinitely preferable to any proposed at Vienna. The treaty, he maintained, ought to be received with joy and satisfaction, and if there was any want of enthusiasm in the country in favour of the peace, he believed it arose from disappointment at the magnificent force now equipped for service by sea and land not being employed.

The debate was then adjourned to the following day, when it was resumed by

Mr. W. S. Lindsay, who said he differed from both Lord J. Manners and Lord C. Hamilton, feeling bound to say that the treaty afforded grounds of joy and satisfaction, and that it accomplished the objects we had in going to war. The 7th article alone, which guaranteed the independence of Turkey, in his opinion secured the main object, and altogether the treaty had obtained, he said, a great deal more than we had in view when we engaged in the war. He paid a warm tribute to Lord Palmerston for the distinguished part he had taken in the conduct of the war.

Mr. R. Phillimore, in bringing forward the amendment of which he had given notice, expressing the regret of the House that the immemorial and undoubted belligerent right of the Crown to capture enemies' goods in neutral ships should have been renounced

without an opportunity having been afforded to Parliament of expressing its opinion upon so grave and extensive an alteration of public and international law, said he considered the declaration signed by Lord Clarendon a direct sacrifice of the maritime rights of Great Britain; and insisted that such a question, not generally understood, ought to have been debated in Parliament, because it was impossible to deny that the principle of the renunciation extended to the right of search and the capture of contraband goods. Reason, custom, and authority justified the retention of these maritime rights, which had been parted with without the House and the country being aware of the importance of the sacrifice.

The Marquis of Granby thought that the treaty as a whole contained as much as we had a right to expect, and that it was one which the people of this country would accept. He could look back, he said, with satisfaction, and to the future with confidence, that the peace would be a lasting one.

Mr. Sidney Herbert said that what the House had to consider was—first, did the treaty obtain the objects for which we originally commenced the war; secondly, did it bear a just relation to the degree of success we had obtained in the war; and, lastly, was the moment the best chosen at which to conclude the peace? With respect to the last point, if the great objects of the war had been attained, the carrying it on for the purpose of further successes was, he said, opposed to the laws of God and man, and would be sure to meet with retribution. But he argued that since the fall of Sebastopol, owing to circumstances further military triumphs were improba-

ble. Reverting to the first point, he was of opinion that the neutralisation of the Black Sea was not the policy of a great maritime Power; but it was, after all, only limitation under another name. As to the Circassian forts, he did not agree that we were bound by engagements with Schamyl to insist upon their destruction. Schamyl was not a Circassian; he had no relations with Circassia, and he had done nothing for us, except a *razzia* upon some Russian ladies. Looking at what we had got, was the House, he asked, prepared to go on with the war for that object, perhaps without our allies? He thought that by the non-insertion of the Hatti-scheriff relating to the Christians in the treaty more ground had been lost than gained. Still, looking at the general result, there was reason for sincere congratulation.

“The great bubble of Russian invincibility has collapsed. We have in a singularly short time proved that the power of Russia has been greatly over-rated. When we entered into the late war, we were haunted with a species of hobgoblin which inspired terrors within ourselves; and we thought that the power and ambition of Russia were so great that State after State would fall a victim and be engulfed in her insatiable maw. I am one of those who never believed that the policy of Russia has been dictated by a long-cherished and preordained ambition. I think, on the contrary, that it has been a necessity, and therefore much more dangerous to Europe, and much more necessary to be curbed. It has been a necessity of her position, such as we have ourselves found in India, such as the French have

found in Africa, and such as our Transatlantic cousins have found in America. Hence it became necessary that some force should be used to confine her within her own boundaries, and to show that the public law of Europe could not be violated with impunity. No man can deny with justice that, looking at the treaty as a whole, we have attained the main objects of the war.”

Passing a warm eulogium on the conduct of Lord Clarendon,—whose skill, vigilance, untiring patience, and promptitude, had gained by negotiation what was lost in the conduct of the military campaign,—Mr. Herbert concluded with an earnest protest against that passion of this country, more especially of the press, to interfere in the affairs of other nations. The popular opinion was, that all our alliances should be founded upon political sympathy with respect to domestic institutions and forms of government. That was a great error. Recent events had broken up the great Northern alliance founded on political sympathy. “We have found, in the case of France, that we can be closely allied with a country which does not possess our form of government; and I trust that, having established a good understanding with Austria—having detached her from the Northern Powers—we shall not think it necessary by hostile and incessant criticism upon her internal government to alienate her people as we did before. I believe that the only moderate and safe course for us to pursue is to cultivate the friendship of all the great European States, whatever their form of government may be; and I am convinced that by such means we

shall best secure the great object which we ought always to have in view—the promotion of civilisation and the happiness of mankind.” (*Cheers.*)

Mr. Drummond, regretting that so many important subjects were mixed up together in the discussion of a treaty of peace, made a speech on the state of Europe, Count Walewski's proposal to intervene in Belgium, the persecution of Protestants in Austria, France, and Tuscany,—with the view of showing that the root of all the troubles was ecclesiastical power; which he proposed that Lord Palmerston should, in conjunction with the Emperor of the French, attempt to put down. To this proposal Mr. Bowyer made a long reply; standing up for the King of Naples—“a man of the most virtuous character and the greatest piety;” and for the Pope, than whom no sovereign was “more beloved by his subjects.” It was a monstrous fallacy to suppose that he needed French bayonets for his protection. Why did we not seek to get rid of our own abuses before we interfered in the affairs of other countries? Why did we not pardon Smith O'Brien, “before we asked other Governments to pardon their political offenders?”

Mr. Bentinck, approving of the treaty, looked upon all its advantages as more than counterbalanced by that false step of Lord Clarendon, the signing of the declaration of maritime law. Mr. Cardwell took up that point. He made the fullest admission that what Mr. Phillimore and Mr. Bentinck contended for was undisputed and indisputable international law. But the objectionable state of that law made it an event that England,

for the first time in history, had given her authority to the principle in the maritime declaration. The great point of the controversy—that free ships ought to make free goods—was a concession, but not to France or Russia; it was a concession to the principles of humanity and justice, which, more than her maritime supremacy, had made Great Britain paramount. Neutrals, uninterested in the quarrel, were greatly injured by the strict enforcement of the maritime laws of war; and they had a fair right to demand that their privileges should not be infringed more than the exigencies of war required. We could not carry on a war twelve months on the principle that free ships did not make free goods, without being involved in hostilities with many great neutral Powers.

Mr. S. Fitzgerald said the treaty did not in his view fulfil the two most important objects of the war—that relating to the Christian population of Turkey, who he considered were worse off than before the war, and the destruction of the preponderance of Russia in the Black Sea. As the matter stood, Russia might possess an unlimited number of transports and of gunboats, which might carry a large force from the Sea of Azoff, or even from Sebastopol, to Constantinople. By allowing Russia to re-construct the Circassian forts we recognised her right to the surrounding territory, which we had not hitherto done. He would not say that the treaty “fully accomplished the great object for which the war was undertaken.”

Mr. Milner Gibson was glad to see the principles embodied in the declaration on maritime law incorporated in the public law of

Europe. He did not think the United States, however, would concur in the abolition of privateering. They had laid down a good principle, that it mattered little whether, if a mercantile ship be plundered, her plunderer was a regular cruiser or privateer. Mr. Gibson thought that both should be put an end to. As to the Address, the whole debate appeared to him to be without practical utility. He felt sincere pleasure that peace had been concluded. Not understanding the objects of the war, he would not say that they had been fulfilled. He believed the Austrian solution of the four points was embodied in the treaty. To say the peace was honourable, he looked upon as a formal phrase, and was prepared to assent to it. But he thought it questionable policy to guarantee, as Austria, France and England had done, that the Turks should rule through all time over a region called Turkey, in Europe. We had abjured all right to interfere in Turkey, yet in the same protocols we had been invited to interfere in Greece, Naples, and Rome. We made the Turk think himself a political necessity in Europe, no matter how bad his rule. It was not sound policy to keep in the Turks in order to keep out the Russians, because by maintaining the dominion of the Mahometans over the Christians we should throw the Christians into the arms of Russia. He then warned the House against interfering in other countries, making them merry with the following sparkling quotation from a letter of Sydney Smith to Lady Grey on the subject of a former interference.

“For God’s sake do not drag me into another war. I am worn down and worn out with crusading

VOL. XCVIII.

and defending Europe and protecting mankind (*laughter*); I must think a little of myself. (*Renewed laughter.*) I am sorry for the Spaniards—I am sorry for the Greeks—I deplore the fate of the Jews; the people of the Sandwich Islands are groaning under the most detestable tyranny; Bagdad is oppressed (*a laugh*); I do not like the present state of the Delta; Thibet is not comfortable. Am I to fight for all these people? The world is bursting with sin and sorrow. Am I to be the champion of the Decalogue, and to be eternally raising fleets and armies to make all men good and happy? (*‘Hear!’ and a laugh.*) We have just done saving Europe, and I am afraid the consequence will be that we shall cut each other’s throats. (*Laughter.*) No war, dear Lady Grey!—no eloquence; but apathy, selfishness, common sense, arithmetic! I beseech you secure Lord Grey’s sword and pistols, as the housekeeper did Don Quixote’s armour. (*A laugh.*) If there is another war, life will not be worth having. * * * ‘May the vengeance of Heaven’ overtake all the legitimates of Verona! but, in the present state of rent and taxes, they must be left to the vengeance of Heaven. I allow fighting in such a cause to be a luxury; but the business of a prudent, sensible man, is to guard against luxury.” (*Loud laughter.*)

He expressed a hope that now the war was over Lord Palmerston would take an early opportunity of remembering that he was a minister of peace, and of stating his peace policy; and, in conclusion, declared that he and his friends were ready to support not merely military or administrative reforms, but parliamentary reform.

[E]

Mr. Whiteside, in a brief address, observed that there were grave points involved in the question connected with the treaty and the protocols—such as Circassia, the press of Belgium, to the extinguishment of the liberty of which Lord Clarendon had agreed; and finally, Italy—which could not be disposed of by an incidental discussion, and he reserved the right of debating them hereafter.

Mr. Gladstone, at the outset of his speech, rallied the Opposition on the narrow character of the question they had raised. The House was asked to express its joy and satisfaction on the occasion of the peace. Lord C. Hamilton's amendment proposed to substitute the word "satisfaction" for "joy." Had there been a division it would have been some consolation that while the majority would have expressed their "joy," the minority would have expressed their satisfaction. He said he regarded the peace as an honourable one, because the objects of the war had been obtained; but, if he thought that the treaty bound this country, as Mr. Gibson supposed, to maintain the existing institutions of Turkey, he should not be able to express his satisfaction with it, far less his joy. But the guarantee of the independence and integrity of Turkey was not to be regarded as a permanent settlement of the internal state of Turkey; its object was to secure her against foreign aggression. The general benefit achieved for Europe by the war was far more extended than any stipulation that could be put upon paper. The war had been a moral demonstration to almost the whole of Europe, and had imprinted upon Russia the great lesson that her attempts at

aggrandizement were matters for the consideration of Europe, and such as to make it the duty of Europe to unite all its energies for their suppression. He regretted, however, that a more substantive existence had not been secured to the Principalities: but that was not the fault of England and France. He took the same objection to the neutralisation of the Black Sea as Mr. Sidney Herbert, and predicted that in time of war it would be found that neutralisation meant nothing more than "a series of pitfalls." It would have been wiser also to have recognised some rules to regulate interference on behalf of the Christians, instead of leaving each Power to do what it might think best. Touching on the proposal to submit international differences to arbitration, and looking upon its recognition as a great triumph, he pointed out a danger. If encouragement should be given to trumped-up and untenable claims, more quarrels would be made than mended; and he laid it down that no country ought to resort to arbitration until it had reduced its claims to a minimum which it was ready to support by force. Lay down that rule, and a resort to arbitration would be a powerful engine on behalf of civilisation and humanity, which he hoped would lead to a diminution of that great scourge of Europe, the enormous cost of its military establishments.

Mr. Gladstone then came to a consideration of the protocol of the 8th of April, and gave great development to the Belgian point. He had the greatest doubts as to the prudence of the course taken. If they looked to particular cases—Naples, for instance—he would say

that what had passed pleased him extremely; but although an individual might be justified in saying these things, yet it was a grave question to consider—it was an innovation in the history of conferences of pacification—what results might grow out of entertaining such subjects and of publishing the decisions arrived at. What was the position of the Powers not represented at the Conference? “I should also like to know what is the exact force or value that belongs to those records that are inscribed upon the protocols. Are they treaty engagements? Certainly they are not. Do they approximate to the character of engagements? If they do, how near do they come to it? If they do not, how far are they from it? If they do not partake at all of the nature of engagements, what are they? They are authoritative documents. Those who like them may claim them as allies and powerful auxiliaries. Those who do not like them may endeavour to depreciate them. Infinite discussions may arise upon their character. Plenty of room for difference of opinion and debate, and I am afraid plenty of risk of something like confusion in international rights and arrangements, will be supplied by these semi-authoritative records, to which no man can give a certain character, and to which every man may give whatever character he thinks best.”

The important cases which had been raised were those of Naples, Rome, and Belgium. Of Naples he had spoken. The Papal Government he believed to be incurably bad. But the question most pressing on the attention of the House was that relating to the state of the press in Belgium. He would

not comment on the language of Lord Clarendon; the contents of the protocols showed what his feelings were—he wished to discourage what was going on. But some very unfortunate mishap must have occurred with respect to the passage in the four points summing up the protocol. It recited as follows:—“That all the Plenipotentiaries, and even those who considered themselves bound to reserve the principle of the liberty of the press, have not hesitated loudly to condemn the excesses in which the Belgian newspapers indulge with impunity, by recognising the necessity of remedying the real inconveniences which result from the uncontrolled licence which is so greatly abused in Belgium.” These propositions were of a most formidable character; they touched us nearly; “and standing here, in the first and principal fortress of European freedom, I do think these matters imperatively call for explanation.” He hoped that Count Walewski expressed only his own views, and not the deliberate intentions of his sovereign. Russia wisely and prudently declined to touch the matter; but what was the conduct of Austria and Prussia? Count Buol had said that repression of the press, in whatever quarter of Europe—“perhaps in whatever *island* of Europe”—must be considered as an European necessity: having thus dealt pretty severely with the case of Belgium, when he arrived at the case of Rome and Naples scruples suddenly arose, and he found it impossible to consider the internal condition of states not represented at the Congress. Baron Manteuffel rivalled the Austrian Minister; he would not countenance any discussion about Rome and Naples, but

he was quite ready to deal with the Belgian press. Mr. Gladstone hoped that these declarations were not indications of a policy, but that they lightly issued from the mouths of those distinguished persons, and that having been uttered they would be regretted and forgotten though they could not be recalled. But were the charges against Belgium just? By the law and practice of Belgium, refugees were not freely received, but were repelled, unless provided with perfectly regular passports; and within the last few years no fewer than from 1000 to 2000 persons had been repelled. They lived in an exceptional state where they were ordered to live. Then Belgium had a law of extradition with France, and refugees preaching assassination might be punished by the law of Belgium and given up to France. The first article in the law on the press provided a punishment for those who in any culpable manner attacked foreign sovereigns. Thus, the law was more stringent than any law in England. That law was based on trial by jury; but to remove the prejudice with which a foreign Power might have to contend in appealing to a jury of Belgians, it was provided that, on a "confidential" demand from a foreign government, the Belgian Government should institute and conduct the prosecution on its own responsibility. If there was impunity for excesses in Belgium, therefore, the evil was not to be attributed to the want of a law, but to the neglect of putting the law in motion. The Belgian law was based upon trial by jury; trial by jury for offences of the press was one of the articles of the Belgian constitution: what was then suggested on the vague pretence of

satisfying an "European necessity" was, that the Belgian people by their own act should deprive themselves of the security of trial by jury. "The history of Belgium is that of a very small fraction of Europe. But though small physically and as viewed on the map, morally it occupies a large position. The spirit of their forefathers dwells in unbroken force within the bosoms of the Belgian people; and as it was the object of these conferences to dispel the clouds of war, not to create them—and to promote, not tumult and disorder, but peace and harmony among nations, I think it right to point out as clearly as it is possible for an independent Member of Parliament to do so, that this appeal to a people gallant and high-spirited as the Belgians are—an appeal which appears to be contemplated under the compulsion of foreign and some of them remote Powers, and having for its object the limitation by the Belgians of their own dearest rights and most cherished liberties—is not a policy which tends to clear the political horizon, but rather one which will darken and disturb it, and cast gloom and despondency over a prospect otherwise brilliant and joyous." (*Cheers.*)

Mr. Hadfield then moved the adjournment of the debate, but immediately withdrew his motion, and moved instead the insertion of a paragraph expressing a hope that Her Majesty would avail herself of the friendly sentiments existing between this country and other Powers to negotiate in favour of commerce.

Lord Palmerston contended that the objects of the war—viz. rescuing Turkey from assaults, diplomatic, military, and naval, and

securing the independence of the Sultan — had been fully accomplished, and in two short years. The arrangement regarding the Principalities he considered to be the best that could be made for their ultimate interests, and as to the navigation of the Danube, the settlement come to was preferable to any proposed at a former period of the war; it gave Turkey an infinitely better frontier on the north. The neutralisation of the Black Sea had been said to be only the old proposal of limitation; but it was limitation without counterpoise and within narrow bounds. As to Nicolaieff, we had the assurance of Count Orloff that the Emperor of Russia would not build there or in the Sea of Azoff any other vessels than those which by the convention with Turkey he was allowed to keep in the Black Sea, and this assurance ought, he thought, to be satisfactory if any reliance were to be placed upon treaties. To the charge that the Circassians had been abandoned and handed over to the Russians, he replied that we could not hand over what was never in our possession. No arrangements had been entered into with Schamyl, who resided in Daghestan, on the shores, not of the Black Sea, but the Caspian; and there had been no communication with the Circassians Proper, south of the Kuban; so that there was no ground upon which we could impose upon Russia any stipulation regarding them. It was a misrepresentation to say that anything important for the defence of Turkey turned one way or the other upon the rebuilding by Russia of forts upon an unhealthy shore. Nothing had altered the condition of Russia with relation to the eastern coast of the

Black Sea. With regard to the Christian subjects of the Porte, every one, he observed, had admitted that the firman of the Sultan was perfectly satisfactory in its terms and conditions; the only doubt was, whether it would be adhered to. But if it were revoked (a thing highly improbable), or violated, the allied Powers, parties to the treaty, would have a moral right to remonstrate. On the other hand, the treaty entered into between France, England, and Norway, provided against the creation of a Russian arsenal in the north of Norway; while the stipulations with respect to the Aland Isles secured Sweden, and placed a material barrier between Russia and the north of Europe. The noble Lord then alluded to the change in the maritime law, and maintained that in time of war England would be the nation to benefit by this alteration of the law if it should become general, though he admitted that the smaller neutral Powers would necessarily benefit most. With respect to the sitting of the 8th of April, the representatives of England and France were justified in calling attention to the misgovernment of Rome and Naples, and he said that the continued foreign military occupation of Italy was a question demanding grave consideration. On the question of the “Belgian press,” he justified the line of conduct adopted by Lord Clarendon, and assured the House that the British Government would be “no party to any interference with an independent nation with the view of dictating the steps she should take to gag the press.” In conclusion, the noble Lord declared his belief that this war had settled division in every

part of Europe—that north, south, east or west, he saw nothing but hope and consolation.

The amendment was then withdrawn, and the Address agreed to without a division.

Both Houses met at two o'clock on the 8th of May—the day appointed by Her Majesty—and immediately proceeded to Buckingham Palace to present the Address adopted in answer to Her Majesty's message announcing the re-establishment of peace.

On re-assembling at five o'clock, the Lord Chancellor in the Lords, and the Speaker in the Commons, read the Queen's answer, which was in the following terms:—

“I receive with sincere pleasure the loyal and dutiful Address which you have presented to me on this occasion.

“I heartily thank you for your cordial co-operation in the measures which I considered necessary for the prosecution of a war, which, in conjunction with my allies, I have been enabled to conduct to an honourable and successful termination, by the full accomplishment of the objects for which it was undertaken.

“It is most satisfactory to me to feel that peace has been re-established on a basis which affords the best security for its permanence, and I trust that, by God's blessing, it may long continue to promote the progress of civilisation and the happiness and welfare of mankind.”

The remainder of the sitting in both Houses of Parliament that day was almost wholly occupied in passing votes of thanks, the terms of which were—

“That the thanks of this House be given to the officers of the navy, army, and Royal Marines who have

taken part in the operations of the late war, for the meritorious and eminent services which they have rendered to the Queen and the country during the course of the war.

“That this House doth highly approve and acknowledge the services of the petty and non-commissioned officers and men of the navy, army, and Royal Marines who have taken part in the operations of the late war; and that the same be communicated to them by the commanders of the several ships and corps, who are respectively desired to thank those under their commands for their exemplary and gallant behaviour.

“That the thanks of this House be given to the officers of the several corps of militia which have been embodied in Great Britain and Ireland during the course of the war, for the zealous and meritorious services which, at home and abroad, they have rendered to their Queen and country.

“That this House doth highly approve and acknowledge the services of the non-commissioned officers and men of the several corps of militia which have been embodied in Great Britain or Ireland during the course of the war, and that the same be communicated to them by the commanding officers of the several corps, who are desired to thank them for their patriotic conduct.”

In the Lords the vote was moved by Lord Panmure and seconded by the Earl of Derby. Lord Panmure, in enumerating the services of the forces actually engaged, commenced with those of the navy. They had fully entitled it to the gratitude of the country. In the Baltic it had maintained the most difficult blockade on record for two

years, without the loss of a single ship; it had reduced one of the strongholds of the enemy; it had swept the sea of every vessel belonging to Russia; and confined to port the whole of the large navy that Power could command. In the Black Sea it had attacked the fortresses of Sebastopol and Kinburn, and by the operations in the Sea of Azoff had rendered the most valuable assistance to the army. During the course of the war, it had also furnished transport to 435,000 men and 54,000 horses. He then reviewed the services of the army, from the date of landing at Varna, speaking in the highest terms of its courage in the field, and its fortitude and endurance under disease and privations. He compared its condition during the winter of 1854 with its present state, to show that the zealous efforts of the commanders and officers had again brought the British forces to an efficiency in every respect almost unexampled. In point of health it would bear comparison with the army at home. He read from official returns a statement of the losses made up to different periods, by which it appeared that the final and total loss, from every cause, killed in action and deaths from wounds and disease, amounted to 270 officers and 22,467 men. Comparing this number with the losses of the enemy, he thought they had cause to be thankful that the scourge of war had fallen so lightly on the nation. He then alluded to the foreign levies in the service of England,—the German, Swiss and Italian Legions, and the Turkish Contingent, stating that they were admirably organised, excellently disciplined, and ready to do good service in the cause they had em-

braced, if their services had been required. He hoped they would now be treated in a manner that would make the name of England respected throughout the world, and render it easy to raise a similar force should it ever be necessary. In speaking of the militia he dwelt strongly on the point that in all former wars the Government had been compelled to employ the ballot to raise it; in the present war a larger militia force had been raised and the fleet was more numerously manned, yet neither the ballot nor impressment had been resorted to: and this militia had given to the regular army 33,000 men. He hoped they would not be induced by the false economy of former times hastily to undo the work that had been accomplished, and break up the admirable naval and military force they had organised by the experience and exertions of the war.

The Earl of Derby, in seconding the motion, observed, he heartily concurred in the tribute of praise paid to the memory of Lord Raglan; the eulogium of Lord Panmure did not extend, but rather fell short of the merits of that great man. The conduct of the army deserved the highest praise:—

“No word of mine—no word that can be uttered—can do justice to the services of that noble army, whose devoted gallantry in the field, whose unflinching courage in the hour of battle, and above all, whose patient heroism in the midst of disease, famine, and privations of every description—keeping alive under all difficulties and discouragements not only the strictest discipline, but the most fearless valour and the most un-

hesitating devotion to duty—reflect more credit upon them than any army ever gained before.” (*Cheers.*)

The services of the fleet were confined for want of opportunity; but no one would deny that great zeal, great energy, and great courage had been shown at all times, particularly in the naval brigade, where courage almost reckless, and exertions almost superhuman, justly excited the admiration of the whole army. He regretted that Lord Panmure had omitted to notice the services of the marines, a most valuable body of men, and who, on the heights of Balaclava, rendered most effectual aid. With respect to the Foreign Legions, he thought they should, on disbandment, be liberally rewarded; and he trusted that the House would not hastily dispense with the services of the militia, nor neglect to keep up an efficient organisation of our forces:—

“I know that in a time of peace you cannot keep the militia regiments permanently embodied, nor do I think it desirable that you should do so; but I trust that we shall not again fall into the error of suffering the skeletons of those regiments to crumble to pieces—of allowing the staff to be disorganised—and of neglecting to retain such a nucleus of each regiment as, called out every year, or at all events once in two years, for a limited period of service, may, in the first place, keep alive the skeletons of the militia system, to be clothed and filled up when occasion should occur; and, in the next, maintain among the men that military feeling and those habits of discipline which must enable them in the hour of peril

to render good service to their sovereign and their country. (*Cheers.*) I entirely concur in the concluding observation of the noble Lord, both in regard to the militia and the regular army, that nothing can be such false economy as hastily to do away with your present establishments. Reduction, and that, too, on a large scale, must undoubtedly take place; but, in the meantime, however you diminish numbers, keep up the efficiency of your present system—keep your improved organisation complete, and retain your men, not merely as an agglomeration of regiments, as at the commencement of the war, but as an army which, though not numerous, is regularly embodied into divisions and brigades, habituated to act in concert, and ready, in the event of the return of hostilities, to avail itself without confusion of those numerical reinforcements which the spirit of the country at such times will always supply.”

The Duke of Cambridge, having been present during part of the glorious operations of the war, bore witness to the courage of the troops, and the cheerfulness with which they bore their hardships; it reflected credit on every man in the army. What it endured in the winter of 1854 tasked the energies of every man and all ranks. He could also testify to the great services rendered by the navy; without the aid of the fleet the army never could have obtained the success it achieved; from the admiral to the seaman, all were zealous in giving their assistance; and he was happy to have an opportunity of expressing the obligation he felt to the whole service.

The Earl of Cardigan expressed

his satisfaction at the vote proposed. He viewed the loss of Lord Raglan as irreparable, and it was to be deeply regretted that he had not lived to reap that best reward of all his eminent services—the restoration of peace to his country.

Earl Granville thanked the Earl of Derby for the speech with which he had seconded the motion. It would prove to the army and navy of England that their achievements would not be made the subject of party conflicts.

Earl Grey, while cordially approving the motion, denied that our military expenditure during the late peace was founded on principles of false economy. It was our military system which was at fault; and if the sums granted by Parliament since Waterloo had been properly applied, the army would have been maintained throughout in the highest state of efficiency.

The motion was then agreed to *nem. con.*

In the House of Commons the motion was made by Lord Palmerston, and seconded by Mr. Disraeli. The topics of both speakers were much the same as those used in the House of Lords, Lord Palmerston admitting that when the first force of 10,000 men quitted this country, it was not anticipated that they would proceed beyond the fortifications of the Dardanelles, nor do more than aid in protecting Constantinople, rapidly reviewed the operations of the war, and expressed the highest praise of the intrepidity displayed at Alma, the brilliant spirit at Balaclava, the heroic persistence at Inkermann, and the daring courage of the 13th of June. In addition to these events he eulo-

gised the power of stubborn endurance, the silent suffering of privations which were borne with the same steadiness and resolution as the shock of Inkermann. Nor were courage and endurance the only qualities displayed by the Crimean army; generosity was equally conspicuous: many a soldier who ought to have gone into the hospital having refused to quit the field. Great as had been our losses, he showed they were trifling compared with those inflicted upon the enemy, which he had good authority for saying amounted in the aggregate to not less than 500,000 men.

Mr. Disraeli, in seconding the motion, paid a generous tribute to the bravery of our opponents, observing—

“While I would join with the noble Lord in the fullest expression of thanks, even to our allies—if formally we might offer them—let us remember that there are some who were not our allies, who were not the soldiers of our Sovereign, to whom it would be not only generous but, in my mind, wise to do justice. The father of poetry has told us that the strength of a conqueror cannot be more surely estimated than by the character of him whom he has conquered. Sir, the men whom the forces of the Queen and her allies had to meet in the great struggle which is now concluded were no common men. The legions that triumphed under Suwarroff and conquered at the Borodino, although defeated at Sebastopol, have proved themselves foemen worthy of the united chivalry of England and of France. (*Cheers.*) In doing this justice to our late opponents we are, in fact, only placing the achievements of our

fellow-countrymen and our allies in their true aspect and proper position. ('Hear, hear!') Sir, I have great pleasure in seconding the motion of the noble lord; and, if it were not presumption, I would express my opinion that when the verdict—I will not say of posterity—but that when the calm and unimpassioned verdict of the time in which we live is

given upon these events, it will be acknowledged that in the late struggle our country has shown all those qualities which maintain a nation's greatness and which prevent the decline and fall of empires." (*Cheers.*)

After some remarks by Mr. Stafford, the motion was then carried.

CHAPTER III.

DIFFERENCES WITH AMERICA—*Motion relative to, in the House of Commons, by Mr. G. H. Moore—He is supported by Sir F. Thesiger, Mr. Baillie, and Sir John Walsh—Opposed by the Attorney-General, Mr. J. G. Phillimore, and Sir G. Grey—The debate is adjourned and continued by Mr. M. Gibson, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Peacocke, Mr. Spooner, Mr. Gladstone, the Solicitor-General, Sir John Pakington, and Lord Palmerston—The motion is negatived by a large majority—Mr. Layard calls attention to the state of our relations with Persia—Lord Palmerston's explanation—The affairs of Italy are discussed in both Houses—Lord Lyndhurst introduces the question in the House of Lords, and is followed by the Earl of Clarendon and the Marquises of Clanricarde and Lansdowne—Lord John Russell brings the subject before the Commons—Speeches of Lord Palmerston and Mr. Disraeli—Mr. Bowyer, Mr. M. Milnes, Mr. Whiteside, Mr. J. G. Phillimore, and Sir J. Walsh, also take part in the debate.*

DURING the course of the past year, disputes with the Government of America had arisen, which, at one time, seemed likely to endanger the friendly relations between the two countries. The subjects of difference were two—one having reference to the Central American (the Bulwer and Clayton) Convention of 1850, the other to the question of the enlistment of recruits in the United States for the British army. The state and progress of the negotiations upon these points were repeatedly the objects of inquiry during the course of the session; but the whole history of the dispute and merits of the question were not fully discussed until the 30th of June, when Mr. George Henry Moore, in the House of Commons, on the order for going into a Committee of Supply, moved, by way of amendment, the following resolution:—

“That the conduct of Her Majesty's Government, in the differences that have arisen between them and the Government of the United States, on the question of enlistment, has not entitled them to the approbation of this House.”

He then undertook to prove, first, that the neutrality law of the United States had been grossly and deliberately violated by persons acting with the approbation of Her Majesty's Government; and, secondly, that Her Majesty's Government had contemplated and sanctioned the violation of that law. Upon the first point, he insisted that Mr. Crampton had only performed the duties indicated to him by Lord Clarendon, and had acted upon an interpretation of the American law sanctioned by the Earl, but directly contrary to the opinion of an eminent American lawyer, previously consulted. It was true that Lord Clarendon had

deprecatd all violation of the neutrality law ; but the whole question turned upon the interpretation of the law. In the correspondence with the American Government, Lord Clarendon furnished Mr. Marcy with such an explanation of American law as proved there could have been no violation of it: Yet Lord Clarendon—after receiving the opinion of this eminent American lawyer, consulted by Mr. Crampton, which clearly laid down that not only was the person enlisted punishable by law, but the person who enlisted, hired, or retained him with the intent to be enlisted, was also punishable by law, whether the person hired or retained went abroad or not—on the 12th of April wrote to approve of Mr. Crampton sending agents, first, to ascertain the disposition of the people, and then to inform any favourably disposed of the terms Her Majesty's Government offered for recruits, and the places to which they should repair to be enrolled. Mr. Crampton had been enjoined to conceal nothing from the United States' Government ; but concealment, he (Mr. Moore) contended, was the very key-stone of the whole proceeding. While Mr. Crampton was away in Canada perfecting his plan of enlistment in the United States, and engaged in drawing up memoranda and instructions for his agents, his secretary, Mr. Lumley, was giving explanations to Mr. Marcy denying all participation in these illegal proceedings, and assuring Mr. Marcy that Mr. Crampton's visit to Canada was only to prevent an infraction of the treaty between the two countries. After the trials of the agents, when the complicity of Mr. Crampton was made fully known to Lord Clarendon, he not

only did not express the smallest disapprobation of Mr. Crampton's proceedings, but justified them, and argued that he had not violated the law. The English people could not object to the course taken by the American Government, or to the manner in which they had vindicated their own honour. The American Government had dismissed Mr. Crampton, and for this disgrace Her Majesty's Government found relief by writing letters to say "they were gratified that their assertions that they did not intend to violate the Neutrality Laws or the sovereignty of the United States had been unreservedly accepted by the President," which was not the fact. The issue of the whole affair was very simple. Lord Clarendon had been engaged in a petty intrigue—as he always was—and he had been found out—as he always would be ; and in this case he had brought discredit not only on his own character, but on the people and the Crown of this country. The House had now to decide a simple question of right and wrong.

The Attorney-General, after commenting with some warmth upon the indications of personal feeling against Lord Clarendon in the speech of Mr. Moore, observed that this question involved legal considerations to which that gentleman appeared to have given little attention. The Government were charged, he observed, with having infringed, first, international law, and, secondly, the municipal law of the United States. He joined issue with Mr. Moore, he said, upon both these points ; and, after a short exposition of the former law, confirming it by reference to the manner in which the American Government had acted

in relation to Nicaragua, he applied it to the facts of the case. The persons intended to be enlisted, he observed, were not American citizens, in the proper sense of the term, but British subjects who had emigrated to America, and political refugees from Europe, and if these men desired to leave the United States, provided the municipal law of the States was not violated, they could be received into our service without any infraction of international law. But it was said that men were enlisted on the American soil, which was contrary to the law of the United States. This, however, never was intended by the British Government, and, he asserted, was never, in fact, done. The United States' Government did not deny that there was nothing in their municipal law to prevent even American subjects, and *à fortiori* persons who were only *quasi*-American subjects, from enlisting in a foreign service beyond the boundaries of the States; and he denied, on the authority of Mr. Crampton and the Consuls, that any such illegal enlistment had taken place with the sanction of the British authorities. The allegation that the sovereign rights of the United States had been violated by enlisting subjects of the United States at all, he disputed, contending that the British Government were justified in accepting the service of the persons in question beyond the boundaries of the United States.

Sir F. Thesiger, in considering the position in which we stood towards America, and what had brought us to it, observed that we had received one of the strongest proofs of dissatisfaction which one nation could give to another, and the question was whether that de-

cided step was justifiable; if not, a gross and gratuitous insult had been offered to this nation; and, if it was, had that step been owing to the conduct of the British Government and its agents? The Attorney-General, in his opinion, had taken a very extraordinary and wholly unsound view of international law, which had, unfortunately, been adopted by Mr. Crampton and endorsed by Lord Clarendon. Sir Frederick contended that any attempt to evade the municipal law of a country was contrary to the spirit of international law, and that the enticing and persuading persons to leave the country to enlist in a foreign legion, which was an evasion of their neutrality law of 1818, was a breach of the sovereign rights of the United States. It had been said that the American Government were aware from the earliest period, that a *depôt* had been formed at Halifax, and that proceedings were taking place for the purpose of obtaining recruits; but he did not believe that they were distinctly aware of the facts, and he pointed out what he considered to be indications of secrecy regarding the enlistment, which he thought were strong proofs that the parties knew that their proceedings were illegal. Even the replies of Lord Clarendon to the complaints and demands of explanations made by Mr. Buchanan were not distinct and explicit. He condemned what he termed the bold assertion by Lord Clarendon of a claim which the American Government could not concede, and insisted that we had thereby driven that Government into a position which rendered it absolutely necessary to take steps to vindicate their sovereign rights,

and to repudiate a principle deemed by them erroneous, but which Lord Clarendon had maintained in a high tone. If Her Majesty's Government, he observed in conclusion, were not justified in the clandestine and secret scheme they had set on foot and carried out for the purpose of evading the neutrality law of the United States, the dismissal of our Minister was perfectly right on the part of the American Government, and we must submit to an indignity and an insult in consequence of the acts of our own. He should vote for the resolution.

Mr. J. G. Phillimore deprecated the course taken by Mr. Moore, and replied to the arguments of Sir F. Thesiger. The true arguments upon which the question rested were, first, if any wrong were done, it was without the sanction or encouragement of Lord Clarendon; secondly, the only evidence which showed that any offence had been committed was utterly worthless.

Mr. Baillie made a general attack upon the policy which led to the Foreign Enlistment Act. He considered that the honour of the country had been compromised, not on account of the dismissal of our Minister, but because the conduct of that Minister had been vindicated and justified by the Government. The charge against Mr. Crampton was that of giving his sanction to the seducing of American subjects from their allegiance, and alluring them into a foreign service, which, he contended, on the authority of Vattel, and other publicists, was a very grave offence against the law of nations; and he insisted that Mr. Crampton could not be ignorant of the acts of British agents, which amount-

ed to an infraction of the law. Mr. Crampton had denied that he had ever hired or retained men within the United States; but no one had accused him of doing so. The instructions of Mr. Crampton were, however, in his opinion, written for the express purpose of evading the municipal law of the United States. The law of nations, he observed, had been violated by the British Government in Prussia, Switzerland, and the Hans Towns; but their remonstrances were treated very differently from those of the United States.

Sir G. Grey said, it was not very easy to ascertain the precise nature of the charge against the Government. The object of Mr. Moore appeared to be to disparage the character of Lord Clarendon,—a character which stood too high in the estimation of Europe to be affected by his sarcasms or invectives. Sir F. Thesiger upbraided Her Majesty's Government for not resenting the removal of Mr. Crampton by dismissing Mr. Dallas; and Mr. Baillie had made the policy and spirit of the Foreign Enlistment Act the ground of his attack. The enlistment proceedings in the United States had originated, he said, in the offers of persons resident there—British subjects and foreigners—to enter Her Majesty's service, and Mr. Crampton communicated to the American Government this fact; but although every precaution was taken by him to prevent any violation of the municipal law of the United States, it did appear that persons had engaged in the transaction, professing to act with an authority they had never received, and whose proceedings were calculated to compromise our friendly relations with the United States.

Her Majesty's Government put an end to the scheme, and offered an ample apology to the Government of the United States for these unauthorised acts.

The terms of the apology were these:—

“The undersigned must, in the first instance, express the regret of Her Majesty's Government if the law of the United States has been in any way infringed by persons acting with or without any authority from them; and it is hardly necessary for the undersigned to assure Mr. Buchanan that any such infringement of the law of the United States is entirely contrary to the wishes and to the positive instructions of Her Majesty's Government.”

The Government could not distinctly admit that the acts done were contrary to the law, because they had no evidence of the fact. “But we said, the facts may be so, and if so, we regret that such acts have been done.” The tone and spirit of that despatch had amounted to an apology. It intimated that we would forego all the advantages we were likely to obtain from the zeal of certain persons in the United States to enter our service, rather than risk the occurrence of any circumstance which might give just cause of dissatisfaction to the United States. Mr. Buchanan had given a short answer to that despatch. He said that he should have “much satisfaction” in transmitting a copy of it to the Secretary of State by the next steamer. That despatch was crossed by one from Mr. Marcy, written in ignorance of the apology it contained, and insisting on satisfaction. Mr. Buchanan did not hand that despatch to Lord Clarendon, because he felt that Lord Claren-

don's apology and explanation “would finally settle the question that had arisen between the two Governments.” It was said that subsequent transactions had occurred—the payment of some persons who had made a fruitless journey to Halifax, to find the scheme abandoned—but they were simply reimbursed for their loss of time. The Government had throughout been animated by the best intentions; and they had done nothing by any hasty, harsh, or even unguarded expression, to place themselves in the wrong in case any of these affairs should not be brought to a satisfactory and peaceful result.

A motion by Sir John Walsh for the adjournment of the debate was then negatived, on a division, by 220 to 110.

Sir John then proceeded to argue in support of the resolution, contending that the Government had submitted to an indignity in permitting Mr. Dallas to remain.

The debate was then adjourned to the following day, on the motion of Mr. M. Gibson, by whom it was resumed. He said, the House was called upon to say whether the policy of seeking soldiers in the United States was wise; and, if wise, whether that policy had been judiciously conducted. Sir George Grey had said that Ministers had done nothing to place themselves in the wrong: but there were passages in Lord Clarendon's despatches than which nothing could be more insulting to the United States—one charge, that a barque was fitting out as a Russian privateer; another, that there was a conspiracy in progress to invade Ireland; a third, that a United States' ship had been taking

soundings in the ports of the British West Indies: and these groundless charges were put forward as the reasons for the augmentation of our naval force in those waters. In regard to the enlistment question, our Government had put their own construction on the laws of the United States, and then alleged that their acts had not broken those laws. By means of an organised "system of persuasion," carefully concealed from the American Government, they had attempted to induce persons to leave the United States to enlist in the Foreign Legion, and then they said there had been no persuasion and no concealment. Had Mr. Crampton told Mr. Marcy that he intended to have agents throughout the country, he would have been informed that it was inconsistent with American law, and we should have been saved from our humiliating position. Had there been no municipal law in existence, the British Government would have had no right to put itself in communication with American citizens without the consent of their rulers; but, in direct and deliberate violation of the law, the agents of the Government—Mr. Crampton, Consul Mathew, Mr. Howe—had supplied money to the persons engaged in recruiting; and the Government were responsible for the acts of their agents. Mr. Gibson regretted that Mr. Moore's motion had been brought forward as an amendment on going into Committee of Supply. It would have been much better if a plain substantive resolution had been submitted to the House, and if they had been called on to say Ay or No to the question, "Do you approve of the conduct of Her Majesty's Government in endea-

vouring to raise soldiers in the United States?"

Mr. Baxter, as an independent member, having an intimate commercial connection with the United States, said, that Mr. Crampton had acted injudiciously, and even illegally, but exonerated the home Government from all responsibility for his movements. They had never authorised any questionable proceedings, and repudiated them when committed. Their policy throughout had been marked by a straightforward and conciliatory spirit, which it was much to be regretted the cabinet of President Pierce had failed to reciprocate.

Mr. Peacocke described the policy of the Government in America as part and parcel of a deliberately-organised plan. Mr. Crampton had been dismissed, and Mr. Consul Curtis of Cologne convicted for violating the neutrality laws in carrying out that plan. England had received an insult which she was either not in a position, or had not the courage, to resent. Mr. Crampton's dismissal was the first instance where a Government which approved of his acts had tamely acquiesced in the dismissal of its Minister. It was a system that possibly might have been studied among the Camarilla of Madrid, and been developed in the ante-rooms of the Castle at Dublin; but it ought never to have been allowed to sow the seeds of intrigue and disunion between two such States as England and America.

Mr. Spooner deplored the course taken by Mr. Moore. He would not discuss the merits of the case, because the more it was discussed the greater the damage. If the Ministry had dismissed Mr. Dallas they would have been guilty of

a most desperate crime. Believing the discussion to be premature, he should vote against the motion, and reserve for a more fitting opportunity his right to canvass the conduct of the Ministry.

Mr. Gladstone observed that there were two cardinal aims to be regarded in this discussion, a deep and cordial understanding with the United States for one, and the honour and fame of England for the other. In regard to neither was he satisfied with the existing state of things, or with the conduct of the Government; a cordial understanding with the United States had not been preserved; the honour of this country had been compromised. He could not, he said, meet the resolution proposed by Mr. Moore with a direct negative, and should vote with Mr. Spooner; but he confessed he had felt the greatest difficulty in deciding what vote he should give. He was of opinion, however, that the hands of the Government should not be weakened unless the House was prepared to displace them. He objected to all votes of censure of an abstract character, unless proposed by those who were able to give effect to the principle of the vote if adopted by the House.

Having stated these preliminaries, Mr. Gladstone turned to the merits of the case. Would the breach be closed up by the dismissal of Mr. Crampton? If so, why keep our diplomacy in a state of half-animation—why not appoint a successor to Mr. Crampton? Sir George Grey said that the Government would only debate the question on its merits. That was a manly although it might not be a prudent course. The Government contended that the

Vol. XCVIII.

proceedings of its officers had been justified by their instructions: that assertion was made in the teeth of the evidence of the blue-book. Such would be the opinion of all—small, he feared, was the number—who read the blue-books. He fearlessly said that the Attorney-General for one had not read them—his references, clearly supplied at second-hand, betrayed the fact that he had not studied these documents. Sir George Grey candidly stated a point of great importance—the supposed apology of the British Government. He said with the greatest truth that the apology was conditional; it did not admit or imply a wrong, because the Government were conscious that they had done no wrong. If no wrong had been done, such an apology ought to have been accepted; but if wrong had been done, such an apology was no apology at all. They had therefore to fall back upon the question, had any wrong been done? In the first place, he charged the Government with practising concealment; in the second place, he maintained that the American Government were deluded and misled. The law was knowingly broken by the agents of the British Government. Mr. Moore had said that these things were done under the direction of the Government; but there was no evidence of that on the face of the papers presented to Parliament. It mattered little, however, if the Government made themselves parties to the acts by their subsequent approbation. There was not one hair's breadth of distinction between the position of Mr. Crampton and the position of the British Government. If, as was stated by Lord Clarendon, Mr. Crampton

[F]

was instructed to practise no concealment—but such instructions were not to be found in the papers before the House—then the American Government was justified in the distinction it had drawn; but if not, words could not describe the injustice inflicted on Mr. Crampton. The Attorney-General had said there was no concealment, because Mr. Crampton informed Mr. Marcy that a dépôt had been established at Halifax; but that was not the question. The dépôt at Halifax was never a subject of complaint. “What the American Government have complained of is the employment of an agency within the United States, not only to give information, but to tempt, to induce by the offer of valuable considerations, the subjects of the United States to go beyond the United States for the purpose of enlisting.” Mr. Crampton did not communicate *that* to the American Government. The concealment of that was the first great proposition in the case. But concealment was not all. Mr. Crampton solemnly promised Mr. Marcy that he would confine himself to communicating to the persons who addressed themselves to him the terms on which they would be received into the service of this country. Who would say that Mr. Crampton kept that promise? But there was something more: was it uncharitable to suppose that the letter written respecting the proceedings of a certain Angus M'Donald was written for the purpose of being exhibited to Mr. Marcy? “We actually paraded in the face of the American Government our condemnation of the unfortunate Angus M'Donald, and thus, perhaps, ruined his innocent and well-

intended enterprise; while at the same time we were doing all that he proposed to do, superadding the provision of a free passage, or paid money, to meet the expense. I think no one will deny that a Government who by its agents pursued that course, and afterwards signified its approval of their acts, is not only fairly chargeable with concealment, but is also liable to the charge of having deluded the American Government. Therefore, nothing is more unjust than the charge which is made against the American Government, of having at first confined its complaints to the proceedings of unauthorized persons, and subsequently extended those complaints to the British Minister and his subordinates. The American Government at first confined their representations to the unauthorized persons, because it believed the answer which was given. Those representations were extended when they found that the answer was not based upon truth. Aiming as I do at a plain and intelligible statement, I must say the American Government was deceived by the proceedings of the British Government. I say we intentionally broke the law of the Union.” Intentionally, because Mr. Lumley, who still remained in America, and who entirely identified himself with Mr. Crampton, stated, in a letter to Consul Dyer, that “a promise to pay travelling expenses would be a violation of the law;” and because at the time Mr. Lumley wrote that letter, Mr. Crampton was at Halifax, committing that very breach of the neutrality-laws by adopting a plan of Ströbel to obtain recruits by the payment of their travelling expenses. “Is it possible to carry evidence further?” It was un-

necessary to go through the various cases, but he would briefly refer to the case of Consul Mathews. Throwing over altogether the evidence of Hertz and Ströbel, and looking solely to the evidence of our own officers, he showed that Hertz was engaged in breaking the law, that Howe was the recruiting-agent in connection with Hertz, and that Consul Mathews was the medium at least on two occasions of passing money from Howe to Hertz. Mr. Mathews informed Mr. Crampton of what he had done, and Mr. Crampton informed Lord Clarendon. Thus, Consul Mathews identified himself with Mr. Crampton; Mr. Crampton identified himself with Lord Clarendon; and Lord Clarendon could only be regarded as the organ of the British Government. Here we were traversed by the opinion of Judge Kane delivered at two different periods. In May, Judge Kane said that "the payment of the passage from this country of a man who desires to enlist in a foreign port does not come within the act." In September, he said the payment of passage-money, the giving an inducement to enlist in a foreign part, constituted a breach of the law. Mr. Gladstone saw no real contradiction in the opinion. The payment of the passage of a man, say by his friend, was not the same thing as the payment of the passage of a man by the British Government. Why, when they had the construction put upon the law by their own lawyer, did they fall back for justification upon an unauthenticated passage in a newspaper, coming long after the acts complained of had been committed? One of the main points in the Government defence

was the abandonment of the scheme. This was one of the most mysterious and singular parts of the case. On the 22nd June, Lord Clarendon addressed a letter to Mr. Crampton which might be construed as an order to abandon the scheme. But some mishap must have befallen it, for Mr. Crampton stated that he first became aware of the desire of his Government on the 2nd, and Sir Gaspard le Marchant on the 17th, August. We began a system of concealment; we took measures calculated to mislead; we continued to do for many months what we professed to have abandoned; and yet it was said that the American Government had no just cause of complaint. The result was a most extraordinary state of things. "The American Government acquits the British Government, but at the same time it punishes Mr. Crampton and the three Consuls; while the British Government maintains and acquiesces in the acts of its agents, and yet accepts with satisfaction its own acquittal." Mr. Crampton had been made a scapegoat, but it would be contrary to usage to allow any distinction to be drawn between Mr. Crampton and the British Government. In conclusion, Mr. Gladstone said, "When I look back to the period when party combinations were strong in this House, when Sir Robert Peel was on those [the Opposition] benches and Lord John Russell on these, I think, though many mistakes and errors were committed on both sides, that on the whole the Government of the country was honourably and efficiently carried on. I believe that the day for this country will be a happy day when party combina-

tions shall be restored on such a footing. But this question, instead of being a party question, is a most remarkable illustration of the disorganised state of parties; and of the consequent impotency of the House of Commons to express a practical opinion with respect to the foreign policy of the country. Under these circumstances, the only resource left to me is the undisguised expression of the opinions which I strongly and conscientiously (perhaps erroneously) feel after the study of these papers. I have had the privilege of expressing those opinions freely and strongly; a privilege which I would not have waved on any account, when I consider the bearing of the case with respect to the American alliance, which I so highly prize, or with respect to that which I still more highly prize and more dearly love—the honour and fair fame of my country.” (*Cheers.*)

The Solicitor-General then rose to reply to Mr. Gladstone’s speech, which he described as a “mere intellectual exercitation,” completely irreconcilable with its conclusion. True, he had told the House very clearly what he wished to see, and complained that the “angels” on the other side “feared to tread” where Mr. Moore had “rushed in.” Mr. Gladstone had avowed that if the party opposite had not felt their obligation to this country to be greater than their views of personal interest, he should have been in their ranks. He had been bold enough to say that the American Government did not know their own case; that the English Government had sacrificed Mr. Crampton as the price of their acquittal—opinions at variance with those of Mr. Marcy, who said

that the American Government were abundantly satisfied with the explanations of the British Government. The simple state of the matter was this: the American Government were satisfied with the conduct of our Government, but differing from us as to the value of certain evidence affecting our agents and not being bound to attach the moral weight to their declarations which we did, they determined to act on their own conclusions and dismiss them. He then addressed himself to the facts relied upon by Mr. Gladstone, having previously given an exposition of the legal principles applicable to them, observing that international law prohibited only the actual enrolling of soldiers, whereas the municipal law of America went much further, forbidding hiring or engaging within the territory; that there could be no breach of international law if the municipal law had not been violated; and that the right of sovereignty was nothing more than the power of preventing the engaging of soldiers within the territory, which was embodied in the municipal law; so that the question was, whether there had been an infraction of the letter of that law, which, being in restraint of liberty, must be construed strictly; and he denied that there had been any infraction; the word “recruiting,” he remarked, which was not found in the American law, had been used by Mr. Marcy in a most general and indefinite manner. Referring to the proceedings at the trials in the United States, and to the language permitted, to be used by an officer of the Federal Government, he asked the House whether the British Government should have been

satisfied with the results of such an inquiry, and consented to recall our Minister at the suggestion of the American Government founded upon that inquiry. Nothing had been done that was not the natural consequence of the Foreign Enlistment Act, which passed while Mr. Gladstone was a member of the Government, for no place could be resorted to for the purposes of that act with greater propriety than the United States, where many British subjects were resident.

Sir John Pakington admitted that the subject had been exhausted by Mr. Gladstone, but went over much of the same ground. He believed that no dispassionate man could rise from the perusal of the papers without feeling that the conduct of Her Majesty's Government had been such as to compromise the character of the Government of this country, and to endanger the peace of the world, while they had been compelled to offer a humiliating apology to the United States, and to submit to the indignity of having their Ambassador dismissed, sensible that their conduct would not justify retaliation. He then passed in review some of the prominent topics, insisted that the facts bore out the charge of the American Government, and observed that these transactions had taken place at a time when every prudent Government would have exercised the greatest caution not to add to the difficulties of the Central American question.

Lord Palmerston animadverted upon the personal attacks made by Mr. Moore on Lord Clarendon as if he would be separated from his colleagues, who were ready to accept the entire responsibility of his acts. The Foreign Enlistment

Act having become law, it was the duty of the Government to carry it into execution, and having heard that there were persons residing in the United States, some being British subjects, and some Germans, who were desirous of joining the ranks of the British army, and of taking part in the war, they resolved to avail themselves of their services. Mr. Gladstone and those who were near him were parties to the arrangement for establishing a recruiting system in British America, to enlist persons coming thither from the United States; the Government had determined that nothing should be done which was at variance with the law of the United States, and he maintained that neither the Government nor their agents had violated the laws of the States. What violations took place were committed by persons wholly unauthorised by the English officials. If the British consuls had violated the law, why were they not prosecuted? They were shielded by no diplomatic protection. Mr. Curtis was prosecuted in Prussia. He repudiated the idea that concealment or deception had been practised towards the American authorities, declaring that nothing was done which they were not told, or at all events might not have ascertained with perfect ease if they had inquired. It was alleged that no apology had been made; but he maintained that the Government had apologised by their deeds, which was a greater proof of the sincerity of their friendly feeling towards America than any verbal apology.

When Mr. Crampton and the Consuls were declared unacceptable, it was determined not to retaliate on Mr. Dallas; and that

course met with the approval of the community. "It is curious to watch the language of gentlemen who have taken part in this debate. Both sides are vehement in their declaration of the vast importance of maintaining peace between the two countries; all abound in their assurances that that wish is at the bottom of their hearts and is the most anxious object of their lives: and yet, here happening to be a case in which a question has arisen between two countries which, as far as the Governments are concerned, has been terminated in a manner deemed satisfactory to both, gentlemen on the other side of the House are loud in their denunciations that England has been insulted. (*Cheers and counter-cheers.*) The intercourse of nations takes place between Governments, and an insult to the Government is an insult to the country. These gentlemen, then, so anxious for peace, tell you that England has been insulted, treated with contumely, contempt, and indignity. What is the effect likely to be produced? Why, to excite in the people of England a spirit of resentment towards their neighbours and kindred in the United States. (*Ministerial cheers.*) My right honourable friend the Member for the University of Oxford tells the Americans that their Government has been deluded, has been persuaded to accept an apology which they ought not to have accepted: that their laws have been violated intentionally by the Government of a foreign country; and that, so far from meeting that injury in the manner which becomes the Government of a great and independent nation, their Government have accepted an apology and expressed themselves satisfied,

when, on the contrary, they ought to have declared themselves affronted and injured. Is that the way to create good feeling between the two countries? Is that the way to persuade the American people to cultivate the most friendly feelings towards this country?

"The House is now called upon to determine whether there shall be passed upon the Government a vote of censure. The honourable Member for Mayo began his speech by deprecating all quibbling evasions, as he called it—all words which might be distorted into something beyond what they really expressed. Sir, I think he might have criticised his own motion. It would have been much more manly to come forward with a regular vote of censure than to disguise disapprobation under the pretence of refusing approbation which has not been asked for. I accept the vote of the right honourable gentleman the member for the University of Oxford, and I should be sorry indeed if anything I have said should induce him to alter his determination. (*Cheers and laughter.*) I know we must not look a gift horse in the mouth; but I certainly do not think that the reason he has given for his vote will convince many gentlemen who have not already made up their minds upon the question. His reason is, that it is impossible at the present moment to form an administration founded on a successful censure of the existing Government—a reason certainly highly complimentary to the House! But I think many gentlemen will be of opinion that this difficulty could easily be got over; that it could very well be solved by half an hour's private conversation between the right

honourable gentlemen who sit there [Sir James Graham and Mr. Gladstone] and the right honourable and honourable gentlemen opposite. I would not, therefore, accept from the House a vote founded on so great a political misconception. We stand upon what we think better and higher ground. We are of opinion, although it may be presumptuous to state it, that we have during a difficult period conducted the affairs of the country to the satisfaction of the nation, and with honour and advantage to the public interest; we believe that the confidence which this House has hitherto shown us is shared by the country at large. It is upon that ground that we are prepared to go to a division. We ask for a continuation of the confidence of the House, not upon the ground that there may be a difficulty in finding other persons to fill our places, but because we think we have done nothing to forfeit their good opinion. Trusting to these considerations—trusting to the good opinion which the House has hitherto expressed towards us—trusting to the goodwill which we believe is felt for us by the country, and not to the argument of my right honourable friend that no other Government can be formed—we challenge the honourable Member for Mayo to come to a division; and we feel confident that the result will be such as we think our conduct deserves." (*Much cheering.*)

Mr. Bentinck then moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Moore vindicated himself from the imputations cast upon him by Lord Palmerston and the Attorney-General. After an explanation from Lord Palmerston, Mr. Bentinck's motion was negatived.

The House then divided, when Mr. Moore's resolution was lost by 274 to 80.

On the 4th of March, Mr. Layard, in the House of Commons, called attention to our relations with Persia. His complaint was that Mr. Murray, the wrong man, a man not acquainted with the manners or the language of the people, had been sent to Persia: and to that he traced the dispute. Mr. Layard told the story of Mirza Hashim; how, to avoid persecution, he took refuge in the British mission; how, to get him out of the way, Mr. Murray determined to send him as British agent to Shiraz; how the Shah threatened to seize Mirza if he left the Embassy; and how his wife was seized and carried off by the Shah. The seizure of the lady led to a bitter correspondence, in which the Shah and his Minister indulged in unjustifiable reflections on the personal character of Mr. Murray. The latter then sent in an ultimatum, demanding the restoration of the lady, the recognition of Mirza Hashim, and an apology from the Shah and his Minister. These being refused, Mr. Murray hauled down his flag and went to Bagdad. Mr. Layard complained that Mr. Murray should have interfered in any matter relating to a woman—the Shah had a legal right to take her away; that Mirza should have been appointed British agent at Shiraz, where we had no right to have either a consular or diplomatic agent; and that Mr. Murray should have demanded an apology from the Shah, who would give no apology. He protested against the doctrine that having commenced a quarrel with an Eastern nation we should carry it out right or wrong—a doctrine which

had led to intolerable acts of injustice in India, and had ruined our character there. Mr. Layard dwelt on the influence of Russia in Persia; and entreated Lord Palmerston and Lord Clarendon, who had the true interest of the country at heart, not to give way to any pressure that may be used to induce them to enter on a miserable war with Persia.

Lord Palmerston said, that he did not think the course taken by the honourable Member—that of unhesitatingly pronouncing his own Government in the wrong—a course likely to promote the interest of the country or the settlement of the question. He would not follow Mr. Layard into an argumentative discussion, but he felt bound to set right some of his facts. Mirza Hashim had been dismissed by the Government when he took refuge at the British Embassy. Nothing could be more objectionable than the practice of taking sanctuary; but it was a custom in Persia recognised by the Government. Mr. Murray resolved to send the Mirza to Shiraz as a British agent—a course he had a perfect right to adopt, as we had a right to employ an agent there. The right of protection did not cease with the limits of the mission; and while this question was under discussion the wife of Mirza was seized. Now the principle of protection extended not merely to the person of the individual, but to everything belonging to him. [Mr. Layard—“Oh no!”] Lord Palmerston repeated that it did. Mr. Murray demanded, not that the lady should be given up, but that she should be restored to her husband. That gave rise to a correspondence, in the course of which very unbe-

coming and insulting letters were written to Mr. Murray by the Shah and his Minister. Mr. Murray did not demand an apology from the Shah, but simply a retraction of his letter. When his demands were refused, Mr. Murray went to Bagdad. We were not at war with Persia, and the ships sent to Bushire were only to protect British interests and the British Resident.

The subject then dropped.

On the 14th of July, in the House of Lords, Lord Lyndhurst, in pursuance of a notice previously given, rose to call the attention of the House to the affairs of Italy. He spoke at considerable length, and with his usual eloquence and clearness of statement, expressing throughout his address the warmest sympathy for Italy. At the outset he reminded the House that of all military tyrannies, that of Austria was the most galling and odious, as shown by their conduct, not only in Italy, but in the Danubian Principalities. He pointed out that Austria in Italy had passed her limits of occupation, as settled by the treaty of Vienna, and for the last seven years had not only spread herself over the Legations, but had taken possession of the Duchy of Parma, kept the whole country in a state of siege, and subjected it to martial law. Now, he would ask what termination was to be put to this state of things? The short answer that he had heard returned from the Austrian Government was this:—“When we can leave the country without danger of insurrection, we will do so.” Now, mark the course of things. A bad Government produced dissatisfaction, disturbance, possibly insurrection. That ended in the inva-

sion of a military force. The possession by the military force continued and increased dissatisfaction, so that practically it was rendered impossible ever to remove the troops, and, according to that argument, the occupation of those districts by a military force could have no termination. Hence, there being no remedy, what was to be said to the condition of the country? The plan to establish a Government satisfactory to the people, and to found a national corps for the preservation of order, so that the foreign armies might be recalled, was very plausible and specious, but could not be carried into effect without the consent of Austria. Would she consent to it? Would Austria consent voluntarily? And, if she would not consent by her own voluntary act, would she consent by the pressure of the Western Powers? Those must be credulous indeed who suppose that Austria would voluntarily give up possession of that district. It was said sometimes that the inconvenience of her position was such that she would by her own act withdraw; but the inconvenience must be of a nature much more striking than anything he could conceive to lead her to withdraw her troops. He thought, therefore, as far as related to a voluntary act, it was altogether hopeless, but she might possibly yield to the pressure of France and England. He looked forward to that state of things with the anticipation of agreeable results. He hoped the pressure would be such as to accomplish the object he had in view. He did not mean by that the force of arms, but he meant by the moral effect which would be produced by that pressure; but he might be permitted to say that,

though he was somewhat sanguine as to the intentions of France and England, circumstances had occurred, symptoms had appeared, of such a nature and character as to lead him to entertain very serious doubts whether anything would be done. Not that there was any doubt with regard to England, but there were circumstances in the situation of France which led him to doubt whether she had at that time the disposition cordially to co-operate; so that although he did not absolutely despair of the state of Italy, yet he confessed he felt very great anxiety and great distrust. In adverting to the state and prospects of Italy, it was impossible to avoid speaking of the proceedings of the Neapolitan Government. Nothing could exceed its infamous conduct. The same infamous system of tyranny and oppression—founded on no law, not even the law of arbitrary government—described by Mr. Gladstone some years since, was at this very moment pursued with greater secrecy, and, in the present political trials, carried on now as then in disregard of every principle of justice, and in violation of every feeling of right. Lord Clarendon had laid down, as a general rule, that one State ought not to interfere in the internal affairs of another, but that there were cases in which it was not only right to do away with that rule, but that it was the bounden duty of foreign Governments to interfere; and if ever there was such a case, that case was the case of Naples. What had been the course which Lord Clarendon had pursued? “It is now three months and more since the Treaty of Peace has been signed, soon after which a note was addressed to the King of Na-

ples. When I asked my noble friend if any answer had been received to that note—I beg your lordships to mark the nature of the explanation and the answer which I received—it was said that the King of Naples had undertaken a journey to a place some few miles from his metropolis, and that he had not been able to send an answer. On a subject so grave and important, such a reply was mere trifling, a mockery and an insult. It was not very unlike the course which had been pursued with regard to an amnesty, to which I directed the attention of my noble friend the other night. I am told, and my noble friend will let me know if I am right, that within the last two or three days an answer has been received from the King of Naples. Am I right in that statement? (Lord Clarendon intimated assent.) I see that my noble friend assents. I thank him for doing so, as that will lead to another question—and that is, is that answer satisfactory? I am told that it is extremely the reverse. I am told in the first place, that the King of Naples denies the right of this country to interfere in the affairs of his kingdom, and not only that, but he positively refuses to give any explanation or reply to the remonstrances addressed to him. I ask my noble friend if that is in substance the answer to the important communication made to the King of Naples? My noble friend makes no sign. I ask him if he will lay the papers on the table in the course of the discussion this evening, so that we may have an opportunity of seeing the nature of that communication.

“One thing,” he observed, “was singular:—there is no country more

open to the power of England than the kingdom of Naples. If the Government of Naples has set at defiance our remonstrances, what is the interpretation I am to put on that fact? I can draw but one conclusion, which is, that there is a feeling in Naples that there is some backwardness and lukewarmness on the part of France to co-operate with us to attain the objects we have in view. This, then, is the state to which we are reduced—that we threaten a foreign Government, declaring that its conduct is infamous and atrocious, and that we require it to be changed; they refuse to listen to our remonstrances, and we sit quietly down and take no further steps. What, then, has become of the power and the prestige of England? As a contrast to Naples, he offered Sardinia as a proof that Italy was fitted for constitutional Government. Under the greatest difficulties Sardinia had not only established, but, by the exercise of great firmness, moderation, and patience, succeeded in maintaining, a free Constitution, and, in consequence, was regarded by Austria with jealousy and hatred, as holding out a dangerous example to the States of Lombardy. Anything tending to subvert that constitutional Government would be eagerly seized by Austria; but the danger of Sardinia was not confined to the intrigues of Austria in Piedmont. There were other dangers with which she had to contend. The least accident might cause circumstances to arise which might bring destruction upon Piedmont. There were great armies on the frontier, which were being daily augmented; and this had caused Piedmont to keep up armies larger and more expensive than she

could well afford to support, and she was obliged to press hard on her finances to maintain armies to defend themselves against the multitudinous armies which surrounded her. I would impress upon the Government the necessity of giving the strongest moral support to the Government of Piedmont, if the necessity for any such emergency should arise, of giving to that Government material support. We never could desert that country without a violation of duty. Having thus noticed the principal facts of the present state of Italy, the question remained, what hope have the friends of Italy for her? I think it right to say that I am of opinion that there ought to be no secret designs, no attempts at insurrection, that we must abandon for the present any notion of a united Italy; and there must be no revolutionary movements. I believe that at present a united Italy is an impracticable scheme. A revolutionary movement would be crushed by the disciplined bands of Austria. Such is the advice which ought to be given by the real friends of Italy. I am told that many well-informed men in Italy entertain the most moderate views; they do not wish for any change in the forms of Governments, but they wish to obtain, and they are entitled to obtain, an impartial administration of justice, and a firm and honest administration of civil affairs. Give them that, and I believe that the great majority of the Italians will be content.

“My Lords (he added in conclusion), “I very much regret that the Austrian Plenipotentiary at the Congress was not content to discuss with my noble friend and the French Plenipotentiary the question of the affairs of Italy.

At the same time I am not at all surprised, because with Austria there is only one rule of Government, and that is—force, coercion, direct military repression. It is a principle with Austria, that the people are for the Government, and not that Government is for the people. There is not one liberal idea in their whole system. For such a system to exist in another country, supported by foreign bayonets, must be horrifying; and with what feeling that system is regarded by the Italians we have most abundant evidence to establish. My Lords, I have thought it my duty to bring this most important and most interesting subject before you, and I trust that the very deep interest I take in it will be my excuse for addressing you at such length.” (“Hear, hear!”)

The Earl of Clarendon said, that it was a disagreeable duty to meet the motion of Lord Lyndhurst with official reserve. There was so generous an impulse in this country in favour of Italy, that he regretted he could not meet the motion by laying the papers on the table; but as the correspondence asked for was still going on, he could see nothing but injury to the negotiations in progress by the production of the papers. With respect to the state of Italy, he was compelled to admit the difficulty of obtaining any amelioration of affairs. The condition of Italy was not to be improved by force, but by coming to an understanding with the Italian Government. He trusted that the Italian people were too sagacious to resort to revolution, which, perhaps, might be momentarily successful, but which could not lay a foundation for the future prosperity and happiness of Italy. He

denied any participation in revolutionary projects by Her Majesty's Government. Nothing had been done by Her Majesty's Government to countenance revolution, because it would be both unjust and cruel to excite expectations which could not be realised, or which they themselves were not prepared to realise. For if they led the people of Italy to expect aid from them, they would be bound to fulfil that expectation. He then vindicated the course taken at the Paris Congress, in bringing the question before it. It was felt, he said, that the occasion for the cessation of foreign occupation would never arise, unless it was accelerated. The Italian Governments would never take the initiative. The conduct of Count Cavour at the Congress was moderate, dignified, and worthy of his high reputation. To him more than to any other man, was Sardinia indebted for the establishment of liberal institutions, whereby he had rendered great service to Italy by proving that the Italian people were not unfit to enjoy liberal institutions, and that rational liberty was not inconsistent with devoted loyalty, and that both might be enjoyed in that country without risk of revolution or danger to public order. It was not to be inferred that nothing had been done because there were no visible results. With respect to Naples, the representations made to that Government had been made in the most friendly spirit, but the result so far was not satisfactory:—"I could have wished to be able to say that the result of the communication which has been made to the King of Naples has been satisfactory. But I cannot say that it has. It is impossible that two Governments can be more at va-

riance as to facts than Her Majesty's Government and that of the King of Naples. Remonstrances have been made to the King of Naples in the most friendly spirit, and we stated to him in our views the existing state of things was dangerous to the stability of his throne as well as to the interests of his country. We especially pointed out what my noble and learned friend has suggested was one great difficulty—viz. the establishment of a better administration of justice—we recommended a general amnesty for political offences, and such a system of government as should rally round it the confidence of the people—that systematic distrust and expulsion without trial or proof of guilt and unjust persecution should cease—and above all, that all persons, irrespective of their political opinions, should have a sufficient guarantee and security for their personal liberty. Now I think that a bolder representation of our dissatisfaction at the existing state of things could scarcely have been addressed by any Government to another. It is true that we last week received an answer to that representation; but not yet having any knowledge of the answer which has been made to the French Government, not having yet been able to confer with the Government of the Emperor of the French—and I hope I shall not bring the Government of France under the censure of my noble and learned friend by saying that the Government is at this time absent from Paris, and therefore no answers can be given at the moment, until we have had a communication with the French Government, and determined, in conjunction with them, what is the course which under the circum-

stances it may be necessary to pursue—I think it would be better not to lay upon the table the note we have received from Naples, and to which my noble and learned friend has alluded. And with regard to the nature of the answer, I think I shall best perform my duty on this occasion by simply confining myself to the general statement that it is impossible for any answer to be less satisfactory or less indicative of future improvement than that which has been given to our representation.” With regard to the Pontifical States, he thought the evacuation of Rome by the foreign troops was not only desired by the Pope, but honestly contemplated by Austria and France; and he believed that, following the example of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, if the Pope would only carry out the reforms promised in his manifesto of '49, and rely with confidence on his people, the evacuation of Rome might take place with perfect safety. In conclusion, he did not believe that until the joint pressure of France and England could be brought to bear in all its force, the result desired for the amelioration of the people of Italy could be obtained. “I can only add that the question of Italy—the question of the amelioration of the condition of the Italian people—Her Majesty’s Government have as much at heart as the Parliament or the people of this country, and that in every way they can, by their good offices, by all the moral influence, and by all the efforts they can use, they will endeavour to effect its accomplishment.”

The Marquis of Clanricarde said, it was clear from the statement of Lord Clarendon that the King of Naples had taken a stand upon his

own absolute independence, and had treated with contumely the attempt of Her Majesty’s Government to interfere with the affairs of his territory. That being so, he could not understand why Lord Clarendon declined to put the House in possession of the correspondence that had taken place. He deprecated the settlement of this question by the intervention of a revolution, as well for the cruelties which would follow in its train as because it would be unsuccessful; but he urged upon Her Majesty’s Government the production of the correspondence between them and the Neapolitan Government, as a means of bringing the light and force of public opinion to bear upon the dispute.

The Marquis of Lansdowne said, if ever force should be resorted to as a remedy for the existing state of things in Italy, it should only be in the last extremity, and from a strong conviction of its absolute justice. The state of affairs which existed was not one in which the introduction of any new complication was expedient. He concurred in the hope that the existing system of foreign interference in Italy would ultimately be got rid of. He trusted, however, that if ever interference should become necessary it would be vigorously conducted, so that it might speedily lead to a satisfactory result.

The subject then dropped.

Simultaneously with the House of Lords, the Commons were occupied in discussing the same subject.

Lord John Russell initiated the debate by moving “That an Address be presented to Her Majesty for copies or extracts of any recent communications which have taken place between Her Majesty’s Go-

vernment and the Governments of Austria, Rome, and the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, relating to the affairs of Italy."

He had no wish, he said, to blame any part of the conduct of Her Majesty's Government, or to press his motion if a compliance with it would be productive of any public inconvenience; but, as no discussion respecting the affairs of Italy had taken place since the Address upon the Treaty of Peace, when protocols were on the table of the House, whence it appeared that the affairs of Italy had been discussed at the Conferences at Paris, the immediate object of his motion was to ask what had taken place in consequence of that discussion, and, if no satisfactory answers had been made to the representations of Her Majesty and the Emperor of the French, what were the intentions of Her Majesty's Government in regard to the future. He called attention to the nature of the declarations made at the Conferences, reading the statements made by Count Walewski, Lord Clarendon, Count Buol, and Count Cavour, and he then referred especially to the occupation of parts of Italy by foreign troops, which, he observed, was a very modern practice, and in every case was said to be only a temporary measure. His question, he said, chiefly related to this point. If the Government of the country thus occupied was good, there was no need of foreign troops there; if bad, and the Government continued so for seven years without amendment, what prospect was there, he asked, of its cessation? Lord John read the manifestoes and declarations at the time of the occupation of the Papal territories, and remarked that the excuse that

the prolongation of this abnormal state of things was necessary to support the Government because that Government was the object of discontent and disaffection tended to propagate and keep alive those feelings. As regarded Sardinia, it was, he said, a question of honour with this country and France not to abandon the affairs of Italy, which he believed would be not only a humiliating but a fatal course. If it was a wise policy to make a treaty with the King of Sardinia, why should that policy be now receded from? He did not advise interference with the internal affairs of foreign nations; he was speaking, he said, of a declaration to Austria that she should no longer interfere. He was satisfied to leave all such matters as the secularization to which Lord Clarendon had referred, to the Roman people themselves. Passing then to the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, he gave a brief sketch of the political history of the Neapolitan Government and of our relations with it, from the Treaty of Vienna in 1815, contending that hitherto we had lost the confidence of the people of the Two Sicilies, and that it was incumbent upon this country, in concert with France, to consider what could be done to regain it.

Seeing, then, that Austria was taking fresh precautions, what could we do further? At whatever risk, we were bound to support the King of Sardinia. We could encourage, wherever we found it, the feeling that dependence on foreign bayonets was not a proper position for a ruler. We could nourish the growing spirit of independence. "I remember, Sir," said Lord John Russell, "very long ago, hav-

ing the honour of an interview in the Isle of Elba with the first Napoleon. The Emperor talked much of the States of Italy, and agreed in the observation which I had made that there was no union among them, and no likelihood of any effectual resistance by them to their oppressors; but when I asked him why Austria was so unpopular in Italy, he replied, that it was because she governed, not with the sword (that was probably not a reflection which that great man would make), but that she had no other means of governing except by *the stick*. I believe, Sir, that that is the secret of the whole disfavour with which Austria is viewed in Italy."

He believed that if it were declared that the Italian States should not be occupied by foreign troops beyond a certain date, it would be a matter of comparative ease to obtain their evacuation. He had, indeed, heard a whisper that the French Government was not prepared to protest further against the foreign occupation of Italy; but he thought it was not possible that that Government could have come to such a determination. Her Majesty's Government ought, in his opinion, to declare either that they were not prepared to carry any further their interference in the affairs of Italy, or that they meant to allow an end to be put at once to the independence of the Italian States.

Lord Palmerston said, the House would not be surprised that Lord John Russell, who had taken great interest in so many important transactions in history, should call attention to the matters which were the subject of his speech, and the importance of which it was impossible to over-

rate. We had just terminated a great struggle in a manner that would ward off for a long time a danger Europe had cause to apprehend. The occupation of the Roman States, he observed, had naturally attracted the attention of the representatives of the Powers present at the Paris Conference, and the Emperor of the French, through Count Walewski, had expressed his desire that it should cease, if the consent of Austria could be obtained; but the representative of Austria held out no expectation of that consent. Lord J. Russell wished to know what were the intentions of Her Majesty's Government — whether they meant to let the matter drop altogether, or what steps they proposed to take. He thought the House would feel that when Her Majesty's Government, in conjunction with that of the Emperor of the French, were engaged in official representations, with a view of obtaining the cessation of this abnormal occupation, it was not an occasional disappointment that should induce them to desist from endeavouring to accomplish the object, and that it would be unbecoming in them to state what steps they might think it right to take. Reasoning upon general principles, it might be anticipated, he said, that a Government like that of the Pope, whose benevolent intentions and enlightened ideas had been manifested in his *motu proprio*, would so manage affairs as to remove the causes of discontent, and render unnecessary the continuance of foreign troops in his territories. Her Majesty's Government felt that the cessation of the foreign occupation of Italy and the prevention of any future occupation of that or

any other State were objects of general European interest. With regard to Naples, he was sorry that the representations of England and France to the King of the Two Sicilies as to the condition of that country had not been attended with any beneficial result. This was to be lamented, for if disturbances broke out in the Neapolitan territories the King would naturally apply to Austria for assistance, and complications would thence arise which would endanger the peace of Europe. This was of itself a just reason for France and England using their best offices to prevent such an occurrence. The Government of Naples might have looked with some suspicion at advice tendered by England and France alone; but he did not despair of advice reaching Naples from other quarters which might produce effects denied to the representations of England and France. It was one of the ill effects of the calumnies circulated as to the intentions of those Powers that they prevented the operation of sound and salutary counsel. With regard to Naples, therefore, as well as to Rome, he did not despair; but he must be excused, he said, for not going further. On one point he fully assented to what had been said by Lord John Russell, that the King of Sardinia, having associated himself with England and France in the war which had just closed, had a right to support and protection against any unprovoked attack; and he agreed that England and France were bound by the tie of honour to assist him to the utmost, although the force of Sardinia itself might be sufficient. He could not consent to the production of the pa-

pers which related to correspondence still going on. Concurring with Lord J. Russell in the generous views he had so well developed, but reserving to the Government the discretion of pursuing the common object in the manner they deemed best calculated to effect it, he trusted he would be satisfied with the statement he had made.

Mr. Disraeli said, he could not understand what the Government had done or intended to do, which would justify the Paris protocols, or the position assumed by the British Plenipotentiary. Was it necessary, or expedient, or politic, he asked, to introduce the question of Italy into the conferences, and to draw up protocols upon the subject, if all that were done, or intended to be done, was no more than diplomatic action could accomplish, without all this ceremony? The representations might have been made without "rousing the passions of the population of Italy." What was the meaning of the inquiries of one who had been a First Minister, and the answers of one who then was First Minister? Lord John Russell said it was the duty of this country not to abandon Italy. It could hardly be supposed that he confined his meaning merely to a note from a Minister to the Court of Naples. The cause of the conduct of the French Minister in bringing these extraneous subjects before the conference, was the Sardinian memorandum of the 27th March—an act of impeachment against Austria and Austrian rule in Italy. As regarded Naples, Lord Clarendon had agreed that the Neapolitan Government had conferred the right and imposed the duty of interference upon Europe:

ought that language to have been used without a foregone conclusion? Lord Palmerston held up Austria as the power that would induce the Neapolitan Government to cease its ill-doing, and at the same time he pointed out that Austria would uphold the king in the event of a revolutionary movement: how inconsistent! Lord John Russell must be aware, too, when he talked of putting an end to Austrian occupation, that nothing could be more irrational than to address violent representations to Austria with the view of terminating the occupation of the Roman States, unless our ally was also prepared to quit them. What would Lord John's motion, or anything they could say, do to support the policy of the Ministry? Why, what was the policy of the Ministry? It was the very point mysteriously withheld from the House. There were two modes of dealing with the question. We could, in concert with France, go to war with Austria; and, after one of those long wars like the Punic war, we could "emancipate the people of Italy," as it was called. If that was the policy of the Government, they were bound frankly to announce it—to appeal to Parliament, and take the verdict of the country on its expediency. The second practical mode was by diplomatic communications—first friendly advice, and then "admonitions" to the ruling Powers, and without fleets or armies set Italy in flames. Lord Clarendon said the state of Naples was "exceptional;" but what was there in the state of Naples more exceptional than there was in the state of Austria or Russia—except that those were strong powers, and Naples was a weak one? Well, if

we admonished Naples, and sent a fleet thither, the Neapolitans would know that if they rose, Austria would not intervene. But it was not only a contest between worn-out dynasties and an intelligent class that was going on in Italy. The secret societies did not care for constitutional government. "We know something more of these societies than we did. Since 1848 we have had means of obtaining a knowledge of their numbers, organisation, principles, and objects; and without some consideration of these it would be absolutely impossible for us to form a conception of what would be the consequences of our interference in the affairs of Italy. It is useless to deny, because it is impossible to conceal, that a great part of Europe—the whole of Italy and France, and a great part of Germany, to say nothing of other countries—are covered with a network of these secret societies, just as the superficies of the earth is now being covered with railroads. And what are their objects? They do not attempt to conceal them. They do not want constitutional government; they do not want ameliorated institutions; they do not want provincial councils, nor the recording of votes;—they want to change the tenure of land, to drive out the present owners of land, and to put an end to ecclesiastical establishments. Some of them may go further. Do you think that, with their complete organisation, when Austria cannot interfere to occupy the kingdom of Naples, when the king is lectured on his throne by the Western Powers, and when, as the noble Lord says, the feelings of the people are aroused, these societies will be

quiet? We know what they did before. Their energy and their organisation carried everything before them. I am told that a British Minister has boasted—and a very unwise boast it was—that by holding out his hand he could raise a revolution in Italy to-morrow. I believe it is not impossible, with the means at his disposal, that he might. What would happen? You would have a republic formed on extreme principles; and there may be many intelligent and well-meaning persons—I do not say in this House—who would say, ‘And what then?’ ‘Nothing can be worse,’ they would say, ‘than the present state of Italy: let us try a Red Republic, or even a republic of a still more fiery colour.’ But the question of Italian politics is not of that simple character. Rome is not far distant from Naples. The passage from Naples to the States of the Church is not difficult. You may have Triumvirs again established in Rome; the Pope may again be forced to flee,—my honourable friend behind me (Mr. Spooner) may say, ‘So much the better’—and not a Cardinal may be left in Rome. What will be the consequences of that? The two great Catholic Powers of Europe—France, whose Emperor boasts in these protocols of being the eldest son of the Church—that ally with whose beneficent co-operation Italy is to be emancipated—and Austria, will pour their legions over the whole Peninsula. You will have to withdraw the British fleet; your admonitions will be thrown into the mud, as they deserve; and your efforts to free Italy from the occupation of foreign troops will terminate by rendering the thralldom a thousand

times more severe, and by aggravating the miseries of the unfortunate people whose passions you have fired, and whose feelings you have this night commenced to rouse.” These secret societies were in a higher state of organisation in France than in any other state in Europe. If Italy was in flames, would it have no effect on the French societies? The ruler of France was a man of rare sagacity; he had been schooled in adversity; a triumphant army was devoted to him. But we all remembered another great prince, whose sagacity was proverbial, who had been schooled in adversity, who was seconded by an army which he and his princes had formed: yet he fell, solely and entirely by the action of the secret societies. No doubt that catastrophe was hastened by a season of unexampled want in France. But what was the present condition of France? A terrible visitation had fallen on that country. If they commenced another campaign of Liberalism, the expression of sympathy without being prepared to support it by acts—if the consequences of raising the passions of the Italians should be concurrent with agricultural distress in France, it would be fortunate for France and Europe if they escaped the most fatal results. He had touched on these points because this was no holiday question. He could sympathize as keenly as any one with Italy; he hoped the time would come when in Italy there would be neither secret societies nor despots; “but these are questions for the closet, and not for a practical and popular assembly.” As to Sardinia, there was no danger to the king so long as he, within his own do-

minions, pursued the policy he believed for the advantage of his subjects. But if Lord John Russell's policy was followed, Sardinia would be endangered, not by Austria, but by the revolutionary element. If they were not prepared to interfere in Italy with fleets and armies, let them abstain from stirring up the passions of the people,—a policy that would only aggravate the thralldom of Italy, and which might lead to consequences still more fraught with disaster to Europe.

Mr. Bowyer believed it was in his power to adduce a few facts tending to elucidate the debate. There was reason to suppose that the Roman States would soon be evacuated by foreign troops. He was told that Cardinal Antonelli, the Pope's Minister, declared to the Austrian and French Governments that he would very shortly be prepared to manage the internal affairs of the country without the assistance of foreign armies. He was further informed that measures had been taken, and were now in a forward state, for enabling the Roman Government to dispense with external aid of that description. When that result was attained it was to be hoped there would be an end to these incessant attacks upon the Papal Government. At the same time nothing could tend more to retard and thwart the progress of internal improvement in those States than addresses such as those delivered by the noble Lord the Member for London. That noble Lord, although possessed of great knowledge of the literature and the customs of Italy, allowed himself to be carried away by his political predilections, and sought to import into a country for which they

were wholly unsuited those Whig notions which could only flourish in an English meridian. (*A laugh.*) The views of the noble Lord could not be carried out unless we were prepared to convulse the whole Italian Peninsula with revolution. Being at present relieved from the responsibilities of office, that noble lord was able to indulge in what had been called "the poetry of politics;" but if he had occupied a place on the Treasury benches, no doubt his wisdom and statesmanship would have led him to favour the cooler and more temperate counsels that might promulgated from that quarter. The noble Lord, he said, had argued that in return for the assistance we had received from Sardinia, we were bound to help her in effecting her objects in relation to other States. Those objects, as explained by Count Cavour, the Sardinian Minister to the Paris Conferences, he declared were monstrous and ridiculous. Considering the violation of the laws of property which had recently occurred in Sardinia by the seizure on the part of the Government of the estates of cathedrals and the religious orders, he thought it ill became Count Cavour to say that the Government of the Pope was a source of danger. In conclusion, he said, it was most gratifying to see the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition concur in taking a statesmanlike, steady, and reasonable view of Italian affairs. ("Hear, hear!" *and some ironical cheers.*) He for one would see with great pleasure a good and firm constitutional Government established in Piedmont; but the exciting language which was sometimes used in this country, and such language as they had heard from the noble

Lord the Member for the City of London that night, was calculated to cause confusion and difficulty in the kingdom of Sardinia. When so reasonable and moderate a view of the subject was taken by two of the most distinguished statesmen in that House, he hoped that for the future the affairs of Italy would be allowed to pursue their natural course—"Hear, hear!"—and that advantage would not be taken of the weakness of the smaller Governments to address to them language which would not be used in the case of more powerful States.

Mr. Monckton Milnes then replied to some points in the speech of Mr. Disraeli.

Mr. Whiteside observed that Lord J. Russell, in reading over the protocols, was justified in asking what the Government was going to do. The First Minister, however, had made no explicit declaration of his policy; he was going to do nothing—a shuffling, miserable policy, which all must condemn, and which would exasperate the feelings of the people of Italy. Lord Palmerston had certainly shown that he possessed the first quality of a Minister—he could speak eloquently and grace-

fully without saying a word on the subject under consideration.

Mr. J. G. Phillimore then criticised severely the speech of Mr. Disraeli, and that of Lord John Russell underwent a similar ordeal at the hands of Sir John Walsh; after which Lord John Russell made a few remarks in explanation. He complained that his speech had been misunderstood. He simply thought it desirable that the Government should either withdraw or proceed with the policy laid down by Lord Clarendon at the Paris Congress. It was desirable to know the policy of the Government in order to prevent premature action on the part of the Italians. As to secret societies, he said a despotic Government supported by foreign troops was not likely to put them down. Those things acted upon one another; there were secret societies, therefore there was foreign occupation. There was foreign occupation, therefore there were secret societies. The people resorted to secret societies, because they saw no other mode of stating their grievances.

The motion was then negatived without a division.

CHAPTER IV.

Life-Peerages—Motion for a Committee upon, by Lord Lyndhurst—His Speech—Reply of Earl Granville—Speeches of Lords St. Leonards, the Lord Chancellor, Lord Campbell, Earls Grey and Derby, the Duke of Argyle, and Lord Brougham—The Motion is carried—Proceedings of, and various Discussions in, the Committee—Resolutions moved by Lord Lyndhurst—After a Debate, in which Earl Grey, Lord Stanhope, the Duke of Argyle, Lord Brougham, and the Lord Chancellor take part, the Resolutions are carried upon a Division—The Ministry abandon the question of Life-Peerages, and create Lord Wensleydale an hereditary Peer—On the Motion of the Earl of Derby, a Select Committee is appointed relative to the Appellate Jurisdiction of the House—After Observations by Earl Granville, the Lord Chancellor, Lords Brougham, Campbell, and St. Leonards, a Committee is nominated—Their subsequent Report—The Appellate Jurisdiction Bill introduced in the Lords by the Lord Chancellor—After considerable Discussion it is passed, and goes down to the Commons—Occasions Lord Wensleydale to petition that House—The Second Reading of the Bill moved by the Attorney-General—It is opposed by Mr. Bowyer, Mr. R. Phillimore, Sir J. Graham, Lord John Russell, and Mr. J. G. Phillimore, and supported by Mr. Roundell Palmer, Mr. Collier, Mr. Whiteside, and the Solicitor-General—The Motion is carried on a Division—Subsequently, on the Motion of Mr. Currie, the Bill is referred to a Select Committee, and its further progress thus stopped.

IN pursuance of the announcement made by the Earl of Derby on the first night of the Session, the very important legal and constitutional question as to the validity of life-peerages raised by the creation of Lord Wensleydale, was discussed at great length in the House of Lords on the 7th of February, when there was an unusually numerous attendance of peers. Lord Lyndhurst moved—“That a copy of the letters-patent purporting to create the Right Honourable Sir James Parke, Knight, a Baron of the United Kingdom for life, which has been

laid upon the table, be referred to the Committee for Privileges, with directions to examine and consider the same, and report thereon to the House.” The subject, he said, was one of no ordinary interest, as it involved the question “whether the ancient hereditary character of the House should continue, or whether it should be broken in upon, and new modelled to the extent and according to the discretion and interest of the Minister for the time being.” He had no personal objection to Baron Parke, whom he had himself originally recommended for the bench, and

whose assiduity, learning, and impartiality, justified that appointment. But it could not be necessary to create a life-peerage in that instance. The learned gentleman was advanced in life; he had no issue, and there was no likelihood that he would have a son. It was clear, therefore, that what had been done was intended to act as a precedent for future occasions. Even if legal, it might be a most unconstitutional act. Legally, the Crown might create a hundred peers at a time, or ennoble a troop of guards; but it would be a flagrant violation of the principles of the Constitution. There had been no creation of a life-peerage for the last four hundred years. In the turbulent reign of Richard the Second, Guichard d'Angle was made a peer for life; but as he was a foreigner his patent was cancelled. Richard Vere was created Marquis of Dublin for life; but at the time the Marquisate was conferred he was entitled to sit as Earl of Oxford. The King made his uncle Duke of Aquitaine for life; but the duke held his seat in virtue of his previous title of Duke of Lancaster. Henry the Fifth created his brothers, the Earls of Bedford and Gloucester, and his cousin, the Earl of Cambridge, peers for life; but the two former were subsequently made descendible peerages, and the latter peer never took his seat. Henry the Sixth made the Earl of Berners and Sir J. Cornwayll peers for life; but these cases occurred when the Constitution was not formed. No similar grants had been made since the reign of Charles the First, when the Constitution began to form; none since the Revolution, when the Constitution was formed. The

mistresses of Charles the Second, William the Third, George the First, and George the Second, were created peeresses for life; but they did not take seats in the House, and those cases had no bearing on the present. Lord Coke laid it down that the Crown might create a peerage for life; but even Lord Coke was not infallible, particularly on subjects of dignity. In a note upon Coke's text, Mr. Hargrave stated, that he did not think Lord Coke's opinion could be sustained; and the opinions of the Earl of Shaftesbury in the Purbeck case, and Lord Plunket in the Waterford case, were against the opinion of Lord Coke. Quitting the more strictly legal and technical view of the question, he then proceeded to show its impolicy. The consequence would be, that the House would be divided into two classes, a part hereditary peers, and a part mere peers for life. "One great barrier against the creation of peers for the occasional purposes of the Government is the hereditary character of this House. To attempt any such creations at present would be accompanied with great risk. No man would encounter that risk or dare to do it. We all recollect that in the time of Queen Anne, Sunderland and Oxford made the attempt, and that it had been a matter of denunciation ever since. But if a few members of the legal profession can be created peers for the short period of their remaining career, how easy will it be for a Minister—an unscrupulous Minister—and we have had unscrupulous Ministers—how easy will it be, I repeat, for a Minister to carry the system out to what extent he thinks proper for his own purposes? It may, no doubt, be sparingly exercised. It

is said that you are not to reason against the good, because that good may be abused. I do not accede to that position. I do not accede to that position on what I call constitutional policy. I will give no power that is capable of being abused, unless when it is absolutely necessary, and some good reason requires it. That I have always taught and conceived to be the correct constitutional doctrine. There were great authorities on that point. When Earl Grey wished to defeat the Opposition of the House of Lords to the Reform Bill, he rejected a plan for creating life-peerages. When Mr. Pitt created a greater number of peers to carry the Union with Ireland, he created no peerages for life. It had been said those peerages ought to be conferred for great and eminent services. My lords, I have listened to that way of putting the question with the utmost indignation. Would you place men who have served their country in the highest positions—men who have bled for their country—men who, by their exertions, have added to the power and character and glory of the nation—in a class lower than those who reflect only the lustre of persons who before them have been distinguished for eminent services? I do not go the length of the old Roman poet when he put into the mouth of the Grecian warrior these words:—

‘*Nam genus et proavos et quæ non fecimus
ipsi*

‘*Vix ea nostra voco.*’

I do not go that length, but I say that while I respect the descendants of men who have done great and glorious deeds for their country, I respect still more those by whom great and glorious deeds have been accomplished. (‘Hear,

hear!’) But it is said this is a kind of distinction that will well become the profession of the law. What, I would ask your Lordships, has the profession of the law done to merit this indignity? (‘Hear, hear!’) I say with the most perfect confidence—and I can appeal to every man acquainted with the history of this country for the truth of it, that no body of men have been more distinguished or have been more successful in their exertions in supporting the liberties and maintaining the constitution of this country than those who have belonged to the profession of the law. (‘Hear, hear!’) I hear things sometimes whispered about their descendants, but when I look around this House I see my noble and gallant friend (Lord Hardwicke), distinguished for the greatest achievements, for personal bravery, and known as one of the most able officers in Her Majesty’s service, and I find him descended from a noble and learned lord who presided in this House with equal dignity and splendour. (‘Hear, hear!’) I further see a noble Earl (Lord Ellenborough), of great talent and information on all questions to which he directs his attention, and who is frequently heard to address this House with the most commanding and overpowering eloquence, and he is a descendant of a chief justice who was honoured with a seat in this house. (‘Hear, hear!’) I see another noble Lord (Lord Redesdale), who holds a distinguished office in your Lordships’ House—intelligent, acute, liberal, and independent—and who stands deservedly high in the estimation of your Lordships. He also is the descendant of one who distinguished himself in the profession of the law. (‘Hear, hear!’) Therefore, my

Lords, if it is said that those who have been connected with the law and have been raised to the honours of the peerage are not honoured in their descendants, I protest against such an assertion as unjust and unfounded. ('Hear, hear!') I remember a noble Earl opposite, who was lately at the head of the Government, once exclaiming in a moment of excitement, and with extreme bitterness, that 'we were overridden with lawyers in this House.' (*A laugh.*) I think that, if we are to be favoured with an additional flight of lawyers in the manner now proposed, the noble Earl will have more reason than ever to reiterate his complaint, and that we shall lose the assistance of the noble Earl by his hastily taking his flight to the north." (*Laughter.*) He denied the charge that judicial strength was wanted in the House. There never was more legal knowledge on which to rely than at that moment: in conclusion he warned the House against copying the model of the Life Senate in France, observing, "My Lords, in our intercourse with our friends on the other side of the water, have we become so enamoured of their Senate that we can admire and favourably contrast its efficiency, its vigour, and its independence with that of your Lordships' House? ('Hear!') It is but a few weeks since I read an official comment in the *Moniteur*, coming from the highest source, on the inefficiency, the want of patriotism, energy, and the backwardness to fulfil the high destinies to which they were called, that characterised that illustrious body the Senate of France. ('Hear!') I have no disposition, myself, to cut down our tribunal to that life interest

on which the Senate of France is based, as I believe the hereditary character of this House is one from which great and important advantages are derived. ('Hear, hear!') If you desire, my Lords, to support the stability and the constitutional powers of this House, I think you cannot be prepared to approve the course which has been pursued in this case. The hereditary principle is implied in every part of our Constitution; we, in this House, enjoy privileges in common with the Crown; we mutually support and assist each other, and we form a barrier and defence to protect both those branches of the Constitution against any by whom they may be assailed. Break in upon that principle,—destroy that outwork,—and he must be a bold man indeed who will venture to say he can foresee all the consequences that will arise." ("Hear, hear!")

The Earl of Granville acknowledged the vigour and ability of Lord Lyndhurst's speech, but contended that he had mixed up the questions of prerogative right and expediency, while he had never ventured distinctly to deny the legality of the creation of a peerage for life. Lord Granville put the justification for the appointment on the ground that an adequate number of law lords was needed for the performance of the judicial duties of the House. As to the argument that the prerogative had lapsed from desuetude, "*Nulum tempus occurrit Regi.*" The Royal veto on bills of Parliament had not been exercised for a hundred and fifty years; yet would any one say that the prerogative of the veto had lapsed? Coke, Selden, and Blackstone, support

the prerogative, and none of the commentators have disputed the law laid down by them—not even Mr. Hargrave; for there was reason to believe that the note relied upon was not the work of Mr. Hargrave, as it did not occur in the edition published during his life, nor even during the life of *his* co-editor Butler. If it was discovered among one of Hargrave's manuscript notes, it must have been one that he had deliberately rejected on further consideration. There were modern opinions. Lord Liverpool's Government were unanimous in the conclusion that a creation of life-peers was necessary, and it would have been effected but for the fact that Lord Liverpool subsequently changed his opinion of the necessity. In 1851, Lord John Russell's Administration offered a life-peerage to a distinguished judge, who declined it, because he shrank from setting the example. In the Devon Peerage case, Lord Brougham said that the Crown had the power of creating a peerage for life, and "*pour autre vie*." In 1851, Lord Campbell gave it as his opinion that the Crown might create a peerage for life. What the Government contended for was, that the act of creating a peerage for life was legal; if legal, it could be shown to be expedient; and if expedient, then it was perfectly constitutional. There were inconveniences attending the creation of hereditary peerages; men could not accept them, from want of fortune or some other cause, and in those days the prerogative would be controlled by public opinion. He recommended the House not to take such an unusual step as that of going into

a Committee of Privileges, while no one had shown what was to be done when they went in, nor what results might be hoped for when they came out.

Lord St. Leonards thought that the real question at issue was not so much whether peerages for life might be granted, but whether, under cover of assisting the legal discussions in that House, the Crown was to claim the right of granting life-peerages to all men, and that, too, after the lapse of centuries since the right was exercised. The question was one of the greatest possible importance, and his firm and decided opinion was, that it was not legal to make peers for life, at the same time granting to them the power to sit in Parliament. After briefly discussing the point of expediency, strongly insisting upon the necessity of maintaining the hereditary principle of their Lordships' House, he proceeded to argue the legal and technical view of the question, which he did very elaborately, and cited a great number of cases extending over a long period of history, to show that a patent of creation for life was undoubtedly illegal.

The Lord Chancellor began by challenging the jurisdiction of the House in the matter. He firmly believed they had no jurisdiction or authority. Whether a person was entitled to a writ of summons depended entirely on the Crown. If a party before a court of law pleaded that he was a peer of Parliament, and it was answered that a Committee of Privileges had declared his patent invalid, the Court would say that the decision of Parliament had no authority, and that they must see the patent. If Lord Wensleydale presented himself at

the bar with a writ of summons, what authority could keep him out? In 1711, Queen Anne conferred the dignity of Duke of Brandon on the Scotch Duke of Hamilton: the House of Lords decided, in a Committee of the whole House, that the Crown had no power to grant a British Dukedom to a Scotch peer; but in 1782, the Crown referred the matter to the House of Lords on an appeal from the grandson of the first Duke of Brandon, and the House overruled the former decision. As to the legality of the creation of Lord Wensleydale for life, the Lord Chancellor showed that Lord Coke's opinion had not only not been controverted, but that it had been indorsed "by all the highest legal authorities,"—Coke, Hale, Doddridge, Comyn, Blackstone, and the late Lord Redesdale in his book "On the Dignity of a Peer." Where was it laid down, in any book of law, that the Crown had no right to grant a peerage for life to any man or woman?

"There are," continued the Lord Chancellor, "circumstances that make it peculiarly desirable that high legal functionaries should have readier access to the Legislature than they have enjoyed of late years. The course of legislation in the other House has been to exclude them altogether. By Act of Parliament, the Judge of the Admiralty, whose advice on matters connected with the foreign relations of the country was most eminently serviceable in former times, is now excluded from the other House of Parliament. The Master of the Rolls is not excluded by law; but at the last general election, when the present Master of the Rolls was a candidate for a seat in Parliament,

great objections were taken to the idea of a Judge going about canvassing, as being inconsistent with his high legal functions; and he was not returned. Then, how are high legal personages to be admitted to Parliament, unless, by some means or other, the necessity of incurring all the expense of an hereditary peerage be avoided?"

Lord Campbell said, in his opinion, the importance of the question would not be exaggerated. It was proposed to introduce an organic change into the Constitution of the country, more important than anything which had taken place since the Revolution of 1688. The change proposed was, indeed, far more important than that which was introduced in the other House by the Reform Act, and this was sought to be effected without the assent of the peers or the opinion of the public, by a simple act of the Crown. "The question which they would have to decide was, whether, under this patent, the individual had a right to sit and vote as a member of that House. He was not prepared to say that it was an illegal patent, although he must add that the more he considered it the more he doubted, and the result might very well be that there was no such power of granting to any one, by such a patent as this, the right to sit in that House. In this country we had no written code of the Constitution, but the custom and the usage in constitutional questions must be the governing rule of their decision. ('Hear, hear!') For four centuries there had been no instance of a life-peerage. No doubt there might have been many such peerages in the course of time, but they must look to the time when the Consti-

tution was settled, and when the law of Parliament was established. If they did not confine themselves to that period, there was no calculating what inconvenient consequences would follow."

A peerage, according to what was then proposed, might be created for a night and 20 peers brought in to carry some particular division. As the House of Lords fully represented public opinion, a change in its constitution was not required. He did not think any addition to the Law Lords was called for; on any point of difficulty or importance the House had the power of summoning the Judges to assist it by advice. He protested against a step which would be unjust to lawyers as a class unless the principle was extended to other professions. It would be a precedent for depriving future Lord Chancellors and Chief Justices of hereditary peerages, and to that he would not consent.

Earl Grey thought the question had been unduly exaggerated; it was not a total change of the constitution of the House; he believed the character and influence of the House would not be lowered by a more frequent creation of peerages for life. Eminent members of the other House of Parliament—men who had distinguished themselves in the public service—might fitly be so rewarded. Confining the access to the peerage to the one avenue of an hereditary dignity, only to be supported by large fortunes, was really an exclusion of talent and merit. He warned the House against referring the question to a committee of privileges, which was a committee of the whole House. It could not decide the point; if it could reject the patent, the

House could not refuse a writ of summons; as far as the seat in that House was concerned, the patent was a nullity; presenting himself with a writ of summons from the Crown, Lord Wensleydale must be admitted. He deprecated any collision on this question with the Crown, backed by the House of Commons.

In the course of his speech, Lord Grey asked if Lord Campbell believed the House could refuse to let the peer take the oaths and his seat. Lord Campbell said, "Most decidedly. I say, this House would be bound to refuse him leave to take his seat." Lord Grey then asked, "If Lord Wensleydale had presented himself with the writ only and without patent, could their Lordships refuse to allow him to take the oaths and his seat?" To this Lord Campbell replied, "We would not." Earl Grey then said, "Yet the writ of summons does not recite the patent."

The Earl of Derby contended that a great organic change in the constitution of the House was about to be attempted: as the representative of an hereditary earldom which for four hundred years in succession had sent representatives to that House, he could not remain silent where the privileges of that House were attacked by an exercise of prerogative for which the faintest shadow of a precedent was sought four hundred years back. What was meant in those days by the prerogative? We lived not in times when the Lords or the Commons had to protect themselves against capricious and arbitrary encroachments. Those days were long past and gone; and the prerogative, being the power of doing that which was beside the

law, it was not then vested in the person who wore the crown, but, as they all knew, in the responsible advisers of the sovereign. Consequently, the extent of the prerogative was practically the extent of the irresponsibility of the advisers of the Crown. Therefore, on every ground they were bound to see that, not only was the prerogative not carried to an illegal, but also that it was not stretched to an unconstitutional, extent. The question of the constitutional power of the Crown to grant a life patent must be discussed at once. Of the whole of the precedents adduced that night, there was only one, and that a very doubtful one, in which the Crown had conferred a patent on a peer for life, and under which that peer sat and voted in the House without his patent receiving the previous sanction from Parliament. Frankly speaking, he had no respect for any prerogative of the Crown that dated further back than 1688; and when he found that they were dealing with the precedents of an exercise of the prerogative of the Crown that had never been sanctioned or ventured upon by any Ministry under the House of Hanover—that was never attempted by any Sovereign of the House of Stuart—that was not even acted upon under the not very scrupulous rule of the Tudors, but for which they must go back to the dark days of the Plantagenets, and to the troublous period of the civil wars—he said, that to adduce such precedents, if they could cite a single one bearing directly on the point (which he disputed), was a sheer waste of time and words. He could not draw a distinction in matters of prerogative, between what was legal and what was unconstitu-

tional. He understood it was intended to argue that that alone was illegal which was forbidden by direct enactment, and that all not so forbidden might be highly unconstitutional, but was not illegal. It was not worth while to discuss that argument, but it satisfied him and destroyed the validity of their patent, that, although within the letter of the law as expounded two hundred years ago, it was at variance with the practice of the Constitution, and was highly unconstitutional in its bearing upon that House. He defied noble Lords to deny those two propositions—first, that there never had been, since the Constitution was settled, nay, not for four hundred years, an attempt to establish such a precedent as that; and next, he defied them to deny that that precedent, being granted, would establish a material and serious alteration in the character of the House of Peers. Could the Crown exercise this prerogative without the assent of Parliament? He believed it could not. He believed it could no more do so than it could reappoint the High Commission Court, or revive any other thing which had fallen into desuetude, and he thought this was not the moment to attempt an extension of prerogative which no Minister had ever ventured to recommend. The question was not whether it was expedient that Mr. Baron Parke and two or three other eminent Judges should have seats in that House during their lives, for the purpose of assisting their Lordships in the discharge of their judicial functions, but whether it was expedient that the Minister of the day should have the indisputable power of swamping the House of Lords by creating

peerages for life. The noble Lord on the woolsack had ridiculed the danger of a Minister swamping the House, because the weight of public opinion would restrain him. But that was the greatest of all dangers if, by public opinion, they meant the opinion of the other House of Parliament. Suppose the Lords opposed a measure which a Minister desired to carry, and which the Commons had passed by a large majority—what more easy than to create a sufficient number of peers to carry the measure through the Lords? The Minister would run no great danger of impeachment, for he would have acted in deference to public opinion, and the consequence would be that this House would become an absolute cipher in the Legislature. “My Lords, if you admit the power of a Minister to introduce even one life-peerage at his discretion, and to keep that peerage dangling from father to son as a bait for further services, I tell you that the hereditary character of this House is gone—its usefulness in legislation is gone—its independence is gone—and you had better abdicate your functions and intimate your readiness to assent to anything the House of Commons may please to dictate.” This apprehension was not visionary, for the struggle would arise whenever a weak Minister dependent upon a narrow majority in the other House chose to count upon the worst feelings of the lowest class in that House to retain his power. The precedent would inevitably lead to abuses. “It has been said that there is no danger of the Crown granting its favour to unworthy persons; but by whom will the selection of the individuals in whose favour the

prerogative of the Crown is to be exercised be made? With that it may be said that this House has nothing to do; but if you admit the principle that the Crown may create peers for life, but subject to control as to the qualifications and merits of the individuals by the Government of the day, then you immediately introduce a doctrine not only dangerous to the prerogative itself, but which will expose the whole monarchical constitution of the country to destruction (‘Hear, hear!’). From the moment you determine to act upon this principle you will have signed the doom of the House of Lords. (*Cheers.*) It may not be this year, or the next five years; but if you admit that principle, and it must be carried to its legitimate consequences, my belief is that the hereditary aristocracy, which is the support of an hereditary monarchy, will be shaken to its basis, and that if we ourselves should be spared the sight, our sons will witness the fall of that monarchy, which may for a time be upheld by the personal virtues of the individual who possesses the throne, but which must fall the very first time its possessor becomes obnoxious to public censure or distrust. (*Cheers.*) To suppose that the relations in which the different branches of the Constitution now stand towards one another—when the Crown, the House of Lords, and the House of Commons are each exercising their legitimate powers—to suppose that such a system of things can subsist in conjunction with the principle now sought to be introduced, is contrary to all reason and contrary to all experience. (‘Hear, hear!’). What have we seen in our own colonies? We have had men sit-

ting for life in the council, and what has been the consequence? Why, every colony in succession has declared against the nominee system. It has been abandoned by the House of Commons, and the colonies are rejecting and casting to scorn the very system which you are now seeking to introduce at home. ('Hear, hear!') An upper chamber may rest upon one of two great bases; it may rest upon the hereditary character of the house—giving to it a stability and firmness, and at the same time giving to the government of the country a stability and firmness which in my conscience I believe no other constitution can confer; giving to every individual of the House, by whatever means he may have obtained his seat, an indefeasible interest in the perpetuity of that House which can never be felt by nominees, who are here to-day and gone to-morrow; it may rest upon that principle upon which the British constitution has rested for centuries; or you may rest that upper chamber upon the elective principle, but upon an elective principle varying somewhat in its character and in its constituency from the lower house. But between these two constitutional modes of government, by means of an upper chamber—namely, by the hereditary succession of its members who shall be independent of the Crown—or by an elective chamber, there is no alternative. If you seek to depart from either one of these two bases, it will be a most delusive work, and one which will inevitably come to pieces in your hands. I hope that neither we nor our children are to live to see the time when this great country shall degenerate into a republic,

however much other countries may prosper under that form of government. ('Hear, hear!') My desire is to maintain an hereditary monarchy, with a balanced constitution of the three powers. To this you must cling as one of the main sinews, so essential to the hereditary character of the House of Peers. (*Cheers.*) For one, I will not consent without a struggle to see the House of Peers swamped. (*Renewed cheers.*) I hope, therefore, that the question will be referred to a Committee of Privileges. I desire deliberately and carefully to consider the whole matter, and, if possible, to act with that committee, but at the same time with a firmness which becomes this House. I will not consent that the Crown shall have the power of calling peers to this House by the mere exercise of the prerogative, or that we shall be denied the right of discussing and deliberating upon the manner in which the power of the Crown has been applied in the exercise of its prerogative. I will not consent that we should deprive ourselves, by our own act, of that which is essential to every legislative body—namely, the power of being the judges of our own privileges, and the interpreters of the laws which regulate the rights of those who have the honour of a seat in your Lordships' House."

The Duke of Argyll opposed the motion, and reminded Lord Derby that he was a member of Earl Grey's Government in 1832, when it was proposed to "swamp a House of Peers." That case, he contended, proved that there was as much danger from the undisputed power of the Crown to create hereditary peerages as from the right of creating them for life.

The denial of that right might, in times of agitation, lead to a reckless use of the larger power.

Lord Brougham said that in 1832 he was certainly of opinion that a large creation of peers was necessary and justifiable, and to that opinion he adhered. But he doubted whether the Government would have ever really taken so strong a step if called upon at that moment to decide the question. He was inclined to think life-peerages legal, but to regard them as a dangerous facility, and inconsistent with and highly dangerous to the Constitution. He strongly recommended inquiry into "the greatest constitutional question of our day."

The House then divided, when there appeared for Lord Lyndhurst's motion — Present, 79 ; proxies, 59 ; total, 138 : against the motion—Present, 53 ; proxies, 52 ; total, 105 ; majority for the motion, 33.

In accordance with this decision the House went into a Committee of Privileges on the 12th of February, Lord Redesdale being in the chair, when Lord Lyndhurst explained the course he intended to pursue. He proposed to call witnesses, to produce various documents from the records in support of the statements in his speech on the 7th, and to have those documents translated and printed, so as to be regularly before the House. Mr. G. H. Sharpe, Assistant-Keeper, Rolls Chapel, was then called. He produced the original patents of creation of two peerages of the reign of Richard the Second, Guiscard d'Angle, created Earl of Huntingdon, and De Vere, Earl of Oxford, created Marquis and then Duke of Dublin. Mr. Sharpe handed in nine patents, extending

to the reign of Henry the Sixth. After an animated discussion it was ultimately arranged that a Select Committee, consisting of Lords Lyndhurst, St. Leonards, and Brougham, should be appointed to consider and report upon the case to be submitted to the Committee of Privileges. The Committee then adjourned to the 18th of February.

The House having resumed, Lord Campbell moved that an order should be made permitting "The Right Honourable Baron Parke" to attend. The Lord Chancellor and the Marquis of Lansdowne objected to the wording, contending that the order must be addressed to "Lord Wensleydale," as the Queen had the undoubted prerogative to confer such a title. Lord Campbell consented to the alteration, and it was agreed that "at the Committee of Privileges on Monday next (the 18th), the Right Honourable *Baron Wensleydale* be allowed to attend by his counsel if he think fit."

On the 18th, the Committee of Privileges resumed their proceedings. The Lord Chancellor read a letter from Lord Wensleydale, stating that he declined to attend by counsel before the Committee.

The search for cases through the Rolls and Records not having been completed, Lord Lyndhurst questioned the officers of Her Majesty's Records in attendance as to the precedents found.

Lord Lyndhurst then stated that they had not yet had sufficient time to complete the researches, to prove that there was nothing in existence contradicting the records produced. Did noble Lords opposite consider that the cases and passages referred to in former discussions comprehend

the whole question for the purpose of raising the arguments before the House? The Lord Chancellor declined to give any answer: Lord Lyndhurst must take his own course. The Earl of Derby complained that the Lord Chancellor, instead of facilitating the case by making certain admissions, declined to afford any assistance: the case was not that of Lord Lyndhurst, but of the whole House. Earl Granville, said that had the Government determined to treat the question as simply one of party, their task would have been much easier: but while he and his friends could not possibly say what further evidence might be necessary, they did not wish that one single step should be omitted really useful to the consideration of the question. After some further conversation on the point of search, Lord Lyndhurst gave notice, that on Friday, the 22nd, he should move the following resolution in the Committee of Privileges:—

“The Committee have, agreeably to your Lordships’ order, examined, and considered the copy of the letters-patent, purporting to create the Right Honourable Sir James Parke, Knight, a Baron of the United Kingdom for life; and they report it as their opinion, that neither the said letters-patent, nor the said letters-patent with the usual writ of summons issued in pursuance thereof, can entitle the grantee therein named to sit and vote in Parliament.”

Lord Glenelg suggested that the Judges should be called in to assist; but Lord Lyndhurst, Lord Campbell, and Lord St. Leonards, contended that the Judges had nothing whatever to do with the question as to the

right to sit and vote. Finally, Earl Grey gave notice of an amendment; and Earl Granville promised that the Government would give notice of any amendment they might bring forward. The Committee then adjourned till five o’clock on Friday, and the House resumed.

Lord Grey placed the terms of his amendment before the House on the following day, the 19th. He proposed to leave out all the words in Lord Lyndhurst’s motion after the word “opinion,” and to insert these words:—

“That the highest legal authorities having concurred in declaring the Crown to possess the power of creating peerages for life, and this power having in some cases been exercised in former times, the House of Lords would not be justified in assuming the illegality of the patent creating the Right Honourable James Parke Baron Wensleydale for life, and in refusing upon that assumption to permit him to take his seat as a Peer.”

Then if that resolution should be adopted, Lord Grey proposed to move these additional resolutions—

“1. That although several grants of peerages for life are recorded to have been made in favour of females up to a comparatively recent period, no precedent has been found within the last four hundred years for the admission of a Commoner to the House of Lords by the grant of a peerage for life. 2. That the grant of a peerage for life to Lord Wensleydale being thus unsupported by any recent precedent, it is expedient that the House should declare its opinion that, as a general rule, Her Majesty ought not to

be advised to make use, without the consent of Parliament, of any of the prerogatives which may still in strict law belong to the Crown, but which cannot be shown to have been exercised except in remote periods of our history when the Constitution was in many respects unsettled. But that, having regard to all the circumstances of the case, the House, in declaring this opinion, may properly abstain from expressing disapprobation of the conduct of Her Majesty's confidential servants in advising the grant of a peerage to Lord Wensleydale for life. 3. That the grant of peerages for life might in some cases be of advantage both to the House of Lords and to the public; but that the practice of granting such peerages would be peculiarly liable to abuse unless guarded by some precautionary regulations. 4. That it will require further and mature consideration to determine what steps it will be proper for the House to adopt in order to prevent the patent granted to Lord Wensleydale from being drawn into a precedent in favour of creating peerages for life, and in order to establish adequate securities against abuse if such creations are hereafter to take place."

Lord Brougham — "Will the noble Earl state what means he proposes?"

Earl Grey — "I do not know."

On the 22nd, before the House went into the Committee of Privileges, Lord Glenelg moved that the following questions should be put to the Judges:—Whether it is in the power of the Crown to create by patent the dignity of Baron of the United Kingdom for life? And, what rights and privileges are conferred by such a pretext? He contended that the

step taken in the elevation of Lord Wensleydale were either legal or illegal on the part of the Crown, and that the question of the privileges of Parliament was subsidiary to the question of law. It was, therefore, a proper subject for the opinion of the Judges. Alluding to the conflict of legal authorities on the subject, he said, that Lord Campbell had argued the case on either side in a very powerful speech. That noble Lord might, therefore, very fairly be allowed to pair off with himself on the subject; and the opinion of the author of the *Lives of the Lord Chief Justices* might be put against the opinion of the Lord Chief Justice.

Lord Campbell opposed the motion, contending that the question being one of privilege should be decided rather by parliamentary than judicial authority. There were also practical and technical difficulties in the way of the plan proposed. It might not be found easy to bring all the Judges together, or possible to obtain accordance in their opinions. In every event their decision must be delivered too late to be available for present purposes. As to the questions themselves proposed for the consideration of the Judges. To the first there could but be one answer. There was not the slightest doubt that the Crown could create a peer for life, or for a term of years, or for the life of another, or during will, or could create any new dignity, and confer it upon any one it pleased. To the second question, as it was not proposed there should be any argument at bar to assist the Judges, practically they were asked to sit down and write a treatise upon the privileges of a peer for life.

The Lord Chancellor supported Earl Glenelg's motion, and urged the House to have the assistance of the opinion of the Judges before taking a step so reckless as that proposed by the resolution to be submitted to the Committee by Lord Lyndhurst. They would thus show the country they were really anxious before proceeding, to ascertain what was the law on the subject. If, without ascertaining it, they rejected Lord Wensleydale's patent, it would be the most unjustifiable invasion of the rights of another branch of the Constitution he had ever witnessed.

The Earl of Winchilsea, speaking on the general question of life-peerages, contended that they were illegal, contrary to the principle of the Constitution, and, if the Crown were badly advised, might be dangerous.

Lord Brougham protested against the term "reckless" applied by the Lord Chancellor to the proceedings of the Committee, and pointed out the impossibility of getting an answer from the Judges without a delay that would defer the decision till another session. He admitted that the Committee were dealing with a part of the prerogative of the Crown, but in its exercise it had trespassed on the privileges of the peers.

Earl Granville would vote for the motion, and urged on the House the policy of taking the opinion of the Judges, as the legal authorities among the peers differed so widely from each other.

Their Lordships then divided, when there appeared—Contents: present, 62; proxies, 49; total, 111; Non-contents: present, 97; proxies, 45; total, 142. Majority against the motion, 31.

The House then resolved itself

into a Committee of Privileges, and after some further documentary evidence had been received at the bar, Lord Lyndhurst proceeded to move the resolution of which he had given notice. He laid down two main positions—that there were certain limits to the power of the Crown in the creation of peers, and that the House of Lords had a jurisdiction and a right to decide on the validity of the patents by which commoners are admitted to the privileges of peers. Thus an alien, though he might receive a patent of creation, could never sit in Parliament, nor could the Crown create a peerage for a term of years. When a person presented himself at the bar, claiming to sit and vote in that House, the peers had the immediate right of deciding on the validity of the claim, and with the peers alone rested the jurisdiction on the subject. These positions Lord Lyndhurst supported by a long and minute reference to precedents, and defied the Government to prove a single case in which the right to a seat in the House of Peers had been connected with a patent to a commoner for life. "I have before observed," said he, "and I would enforce it upon your Lordships' minds, that long-continued usage is the basis and principle of our laws and our Constitution. ('Hear, hear!') It is upon that our whole system depends. Look at the succession to the Crown. The descent does not follow the rules in ordinary cases, but depends entirely upon long-continued usage. The privileges and rights of Parliament also depend upon the same basis. If you break in upon that principle you destroy it. I exhort your

Lordships to consider well before arriving at any decision on this matter. The Constitution consists of three estates—Queen, Lords, and Commons—united, but independent of each other, producing harmony by the balance of powers. Can it for a moment be contended that one of those estates has the power, by its own fiat, of remodelling one of the other estates, destroying that balance, and overturning that harmony? If so, what becomes of the Constitution? ('Hear!') Something has been said, as a kind of justification of the measure which we are discussing, about the judicature of this House and its administration of justice. Let me tell your Lordships that, if there be any defect in that tribunal, you have a remedy in your own hands. ('Hear, hear!') About two or three years ago I ventured to point out the course which might be pursued in that respect, and referred to the issue of 'writs of assistance,' by which the House could call in common-law or equity Judges to assist them; and if some of the Judges of Scotland were made privy councillors, they may also be called in to assist in the judicial business of this House relating to that portion of the kingdom. ('Hear, hear!') But, my Lords, the principle upon which I proceed—the old constitutional principle, is, that I will give the Crown no power that is capable of being abused, unless some great and overruling necessity can be shown to exist. In the present case, my Lords, no such overruling necessity has been shown to exist. I look with all constitutional jealousy, and not with confidence, to those who are the depositaries of power. (*Cheers.*)

I remember it was over and over again said by one of the most illustrious statesmen England ever produced, that jealousy, and not confidence, was the maxim on which the British Constitution was based. (*Cheers.*) I believe the noble marquis opposite (Lansdowne) is a decided, uniform, and constant adherent to that principle. Jealousy and not confidence is the eternal governing principle of the British Constitution. It is true, my Lords, that the danger of any undue exercise of its prerogatives by the Crown may at present be remote. But how long the present state of things may continue, how long it may be before a storm may arise, when important questions may start up, and the passions may be aggravated and excited, no one can venture to foretell. A day may arise when an arbitrary monarch, who may be desirous of increasing his prerogative, may again sit on the throne, and I am therefore anxious, my Lords, to guard against any such danger. We all remember in the reign of James II. the conspiracies of that monarch, who by cabals was most unconstitutionally plotting the destruction of the living Constitution. My Lords, the time has been when there have been men who have had the determination to establish an arbitrary monarchy. We know that James II. determined to repeal the Test Act, and to violate the Constitution, for the purpose of obtaining a pliable House of Commons; but when he obtained it, the question arose how he should deal with the House of Lords. I will read an extract from Mr. Macaulay's *History* which is pertinent to the present question, and will serve to show what difficulties may arise, against which

it is our duty to guard ourselves beforehand. He says: 'Whatever may have been formerly the constitution of the legislative assemblies of the realm, the dignity of peer of the realm (from the time the present constitution of those assemblies was clearly established until the union of England and Scotland) gave to the possessor of that dignity, as one of its inherent rights, the character of a member of such assemblies.' I think, my Lords, this will show that it is wise to devise guards against such attempts being made at a future period, and that it may not be unnecessary even to strengthen the rights and privileges of your Lordships' House. Never was the necessity of caution more strongly exemplified than in the case of the late King of the French. He changed an hereditary peerage into a peerage for life. He soon found that the defence and barrier which should have protected him in times of difficulty and of danger had been destroyed by the course which he pursued in order to obtain a little transient popularity, and he found himself alone—deserted by his former adherents, surrounded only by a few false friends and insidious advisers. He fled disguised, and he died dethroned and in exile."

Earl Grey contended that the right of the Crown to grant hereditary peerages involved the power of granting them for life; in fact, life-peerages had been created down to the time of George II.; that these patents were given to women did not affect the principle; they had all the rights of peers, with the exception of being summoned to Parliament. They were summoned as peeresses to attend coronations, and if they

committed offences they would be tried by the House of Peers, not by a court of law. Most of the arguments used by Lord Lyndhurst resolved themselves into the proof of disuse of the power of the Crown, and an assumption that the hereditary principle was the essence of the peerage. If they rejected the patent of Lord Wensleydale, they would create a very dangerous precedent, as the majority of the House would be erected into an irresponsible tribunal, deciding on the acts of the Crown, and that majority being quite uncontrolled, the balance of the Constitution would be destroyed. He concluded by moving his amendment.

Lord Stanhope supported the original motion, though he admitted the judicial functions of the House, as far as the lay peers were concerned, were a mere mockery.

The Duke of Argyll defended the grant of a patent to Lord Wensleydale, and ascribed much of the opposition to it to professional feeling among the law lords, who feared that no lawyer would hereafter be created an hereditary peer. The policy and necessity of the measure had not been disputed.

Lord Brougham declared that he had now no doubt the creation of a peerage for life, with the right of sitting in Parliament, was beyond the prerogative, wholly unknown to the law, and therefore illegal. He cited many powers anciently exercised by the Crown, with regard to taxation and representation, which, having for a long period fallen into desuetude, would be considered tyrannical if now revived as parts of the prerogative. The long disuse

of the right now exercised was of the utmost importance; and he denied that because the Crown had the unquestioned right to create hereditary peerages it had therefore the power to make them for life, as something less. They were a totally different thing. He did not believe, if the House exercised its undoubted privileges, there was any danger of giving offence to the Crown; that was an utter impossibility, and it was a question with which the House of Commons had nothing whatever to do. The peers might as well interfere with that House in any case of disputed election.

The Lord Chancellor explained the law respecting writs of summons, and contended that the writ alone was the authority by which a peer took his seat. There were cases in dangerous times when peers had been heavily fined for not obeying the writ; whoever received one was bound to obey it; and Lord Wensleydale was exactly in that position. The report of the Committee impeached the writ as well as the patent, and if the House persisted in refusing to admit Lord Wensleydale, it would be the most extraordinary invasion of the prerogative he had ever heard of. He thought the argument that this power might be abused absurd, as any attempt to do so would be checked by public opinion; nor was the right of creating hereditary peerages less liable to the same alleged objection.

On a division the numbers were for Earl Grey's amendment, 57; against it, 92. Majority, 35.

Lord Lyndhurst's resolution was then put, and agreed to.

On a subsequent day Lord Redesdale brought up the report of the

Committee, when Earl Granville, though expressing the disinclination of the Government to receive the report, stated that it was not their intention to divide the House again on the question. He admitted that the Government found itself in a position of no ordinary difficulty, and trusted that the question would now be calmly considered without party or political feelings.

Lord Campbell expressed his satisfaction at Lord Granville's statement.

The Earl of Derby also expressed his satisfaction. The House had no other alternative but to admit or reject an unlimited exercise of the royal prerogative. The matter had been forced upon them, for nothing could be more painful to the House than to come into collision with the Crown. After the large majority against the measure, he thought it would have been more satisfactory if Her Majesty's Government had conferred an hereditary peerage upon Baron Parke. The discussion upon the question of life-peerages would be facilitated by such a step. The main question of conferring life-peerages was of considerable importance, and the Government should give some explanation of their object for desiring to establish so novel a precedent. The two points, conferring an honour upon an individual and insuring the more efficient conduct of the business of the House, widely differed. As to the point of limitation, that was a mere question of degree, and did not remove any objection to the principle of the measure. Of those classes on whom these peerages might possibly be conferred, he believed that the independence of thought

of literary and scientific men would be imperilled, that naval and military officers would not value such second-rate rewards, and as to lawyers, if they were admitted to strengthen the judicial functions of the House, which he was not prepared to declare altogether satisfactory, the remedy would, he feared, be worse than the disease. He was not going then to enter into a discussion upon the existing condition of the House as a court of appellate jurisdiction, but would give notice of his intention to move on Thursday for a select committee to consider the expediency of making provisions for the more efficient discharge of the duties of the House as a court of appeal.

After some further discussion, in which the Marquis of Lansdowne, Lords Malmesbury, Brougham, Grey, and other peers took part, it was ordered that the report of this Committee should be received, and thus practically terminated the struggle upon this great constitutional question, for no further effort was made on the part of Lord Wensleydale to claim his seat, and an hereditary peerage was shortly afterwards conferred upon him in the usual way.

On the 28th of February the Earl of Derby submitted to the House the motion of which he had given notice, relative to its appellate jurisdiction, describing the appellate jurisdiction of the House as a power inherited from the earliest times. Lord Derby said that, notwithstanding its antiquity and the high value he placed upon the privilege, he did not think it essential to the fitting discharge of the other functions of the House. The arguments against the manner in which the judicial functions were

at present discharged were seven in number, viz.:—first, the small number of the Judges; secondly, that their attendance was not compulsory; thirdly, that their number was uncertain; fourthly, that there was a chance of the failure of justice from the circumstance of no judgment being delivered; fifthly, that in some cases there was an appeal from some individual in one capacity to the same sitting in another; sixthly, that the tribunal sat only during half the year, so that during the remaining half there was (it was said) a denial of justice to suitors; and, seventhly, that there was no adequate tribunal to decide Scotch appeals. Some of these objections had been exaggerated, but there were difficulties in the way of remedying any of them. The creation of life peers, or creating certain legal functionaries life peers, would not compel their attendance in the House, and would only increase the number without adding to the weight or authority of the tribunal. The noble Lord then entered into the question at some length, and concluded by suggesting that, in cases of common law, the House should call in the advice of the common law Judges; in cases of equity, that of the Vice-chancellors; and have the power, in Scotch cases, of summoning to its aid some of the most eminent of the Scotch Judges,—all cases to be referred to the legal members of the House, as a judicial committee, which should embody the decision of the Judges in a report to the whole House, and agreed to as a matter of form, but still preserving to it the right of its jurisdiction.

Earl Granville moved as an amendment the addition to the motion of the words—“and fur-

ther, how any such provision would affect the character of this House." He thought Earl Derby's motion the most fitting opportunity of considering the judicial question, and regretted that the subject of the constitution of the peers had been introduced in the other House of Parliament.

Lord Campbell concurred in the motion, and supported Lord Derby's suggestion. Let them have a Judicial Committee of their own House, according to the ancient practice when the King's ordinary Council constituted a Judicial Committee. There was a precedent for it from the remotest times; and he quoted one from the records of the reign of Richard the Second.

Lord St. Leonards said, that no complaints had been made touching the appellate jurisdiction of the House until within a short period. Yet never had more attention been given to the hearing and decision of cases than during the period of discontent. It was supposed that cases are common where two law lords sat on appeals and differed. There never was a greater mistake. During the three sessions he sat as a law lord with Lord Cranworth, eighty-one cases had been decided: in seventy-one the law lords were agreed; in the great Bridgewater case the Lord Chancellor was opposed to four law lords; five cases were decided by a majority; and in four cases only did Lord St. Leonards and Lord Cranworth sitting alone differ from each other: in those cases, "two were affirmed in accordance with my opinion, and two in accordance with the opinion of my noble friend." He urged them to preserve the appellate jurisdiction, as one of the main pillars of that House; and to improve its effi-

ciency. But he was quite sure that the suggestion of the noble Earl, of giving to a Committee of their Lordships' House that jurisdiction which belonged to the House itself, would never answer.

Lord Brougham trusted there would be a strenuous inquiry. He concurred with Lord Derby, that it would be better for the House to abandon its judicial functions than not provide a remedy for existing defects. But to that course he hoped they would never be driven.

The Lord Chancellor expressed his opinion that the judicial character of the House was not lost in the estimation of the country; and he argued in support of that opinion.

The motion, as amended, was agreed to; and the following peers were nominated as a Committee:

The Lord Chancellor, the Lord President, the Duke of Somerset, the Marquis of Lansdowne, the Earl of Derby, Earl Stanhope, the Earl of Carnarvon, the Earl of Ellenborough, Earl Grey, the Earl of Aberdeen, the Duke of Argyll, Lord Redesdale, Lord Lyndhurst, Lord Brougham, Lord Abinger, Lord Elgin, Lord St. Leonards, and Lord Glenelg.

This Committee subsequently made their report, from which it appeared they had examined the leading counsel practising in the House of Lords, the Lord Justice Clerk and Lord Justice General of Scotland, Vice-Chancellor Stuart, and Lord St. Leonards. The witnesses and Committee generally had agreed that it was desirable to retain the appellate jurisdiction in the House, but the preponderance of opinion was against the existing system. None of the law lords,

except the Lord Chancellor, were bound to sit. The annual prorogation occasioned an inconvenient interruption of appeal business. The forms were unnecessarily expensive, and the absence of official dress deprived the House of the solemnity which attended ordinary judicial proceedings. The evidence with respect to Scotch appeals was conflicting. The lawyers of Edinburgh objected to the absence of a Scotch Judge in the Appeal Court. The mercantile classes and the community at large did not express that objection, and there was a general concurrence in the advantages of an appeal from Scotland to the House of Lords. The Committee reported that they saw considerable force in the objection, that the final court of appeal was so constituted as never to include a person necessarily acquainted with Scotch law; but they were of opinion that no fixed or invariable rule should be adopted on the subject.

The proposals of the Committee were these. That two new offices should be created, to be held by two law lords, as "Deputy-Speakers of the House of Lords." The Crown to appoint to those two offices only such persons as should have filled high judicial offices for five years; the tenure to be exactly the same as the tenure of judicial seats. The salary to be such as, with or without any pension, would make up an income of 6000*l.* a year. These offices not to interfere with the Crown in the appointment of unpaid Deputy-Speakers. These two officers should sit with the Lord Chancellor on appeals; the Court to sit notwithstanding the prorogation of Parliament.

"The attention of the Com-

mittee has been drawn to the difficulty which may, in some cases, be felt hereafter of appointing the most fit persons to judicial offices connected with the House of Lords, if it cannot be done without conferring on them hereditary peerages; and it appears to the Committee advisable, that any person appointed to such an office should be enabled, by authority of Parliament, to sit and vote in the House, and enjoy all the rights and privileges of a peer of Parliament, under a patent conferring a peerage for life only, if the Crown may have granted, or shall grant, the same to such persons in preference to an hereditary peerage; provided always, that not more than four persons shall have seats in the House at one time as Peers for life."

The Appellate Jurisdiction Bill, founded upon this recommendation of the Committee, was originated in the House of Lords. The Lord Chancellor, in moving the second reading on the 30th of May, explained that it was proposed by the Bill that the Crown should call to the House of Lords, as peers for life, two Judges who had sat on the bench five years, to assist the Chancellor in hearing appeals. These peers for life were to be called Deputy-Speakers, with salaries equal to those of the Judges of the courts of common law. The Bill also enabled sittings in appeal to be held during a prorogation. Other points, which had also been matters of complaint, were stated in the report of the Committee, but as they could be remedied by a simple order of the House, they had not been included in the bill; they referred to the cost of the proceedings, the costume of the Judges, and securing

a *quorum* of peers or making a House. These points were reserved for regulation apart from the measure.

The Bill was supported by the Earl of Derby, and Lord Campbell expressed his thorough approval of it. After considerable discussion, it was read a third time and passed the House of Lords.

In the House of Commons, the Bill occasioned a long and important debate on the 7th of July. Early on that evening Mr. Evelyn Denison presented a petition from Baron Wensleydale, setting forth that he had been created a Peer of the United Kingdom for the term of his natural life; but that the House of Peers had decided that he was not entitled to sit in Parliament, either in virtue of the letters-patent granting the peerage, or the said letters-patent with the usual writ of summons; that he believed the Crown had the undoubted prerogative of creating peerage for life only; that a Bill "to make better provision for the discharge of the Appellate Jurisdiction of the House of Lords," which had passed that House, and now stood for second reading before the House of Commons, did not save the Queen's prerogative as to the creation of life peers of Parliament; that the said Bill, unless amended, will be held effectually to prevent the future exercise of the Royal prerogative, and to prejudice the rights of the petitioner to sit and vote in the House of Lords; that he ought not to be prejudiced in the exercise of his right either to raise the question by legal proceedings or to petition the House of Lords to rescind its resolution; and he therefore prays the House so to amend the Bill as to leave the prerogative in this

respect and his right in virtue of its exercise to sit and vote in the House of Lords entirely unaffected by the Bill, "more especially as the question of Her Majesty's prerogative and the petitioner's right is in nowise necessary to be considered with a view to the efficiency of the Bill as an improvement of the appellate jurisdiction."

Shortly after this petition was presented, the Attorney-General moved the second reading of the Bill in a speech, explaining the position of the appellate jurisdiction and the character of the proposed remedy, without much advocacy of that remedy, and almost omitting the topic supplied by Lord Wensleydale's petition. He described the unsatisfactory state of the House of Lords as a court of appeal, — frequently only two, not unfrequently only one, Judge, the Lord Chancellor, sitting on important cases of appeal; the inconvenience arising from delay during the prorogation of Parliament; the impossibility of procuring compulsory attendance on appeals; — all evils that could not be obviated without an Act of Parliament. The House would have to consider whether the Bill sent down by the Lords was the best and only remedy. Some thought it would be better to withdraw the appellate jurisdiction from the House of Lords: but there were grave if not insuperable difficulties to that course. It had been said that to do so would be to strip the House of Lords of one of the elements of its dignity; he could not look upon it in that light, because he saw no necessary connection between the legislative functions of the House of Lords, and those judicial functions which

after all are exercised by the law lords, the lay lords acting as mutes. But if those functions were transferred, to what tribunal should they be transferred? To the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, some said. But if that were made the sole tribunal of appeal, it must be recast. There was a greater difficulty in the way: the last thing the Lords would consent to was the surrender of their jurisdiction, and there was nothing left but to improve it. They had frustrated Her Majesty's will by refusing to admit Lord Wensleydale. How, then, was a sufficient number of able men to be provided? Large fortunes were not made at the Bar as formerly, and lawyers would not take upon themselves the burden of an hereditary peerage. What was to be done? If the Commons should enter into a contest with the House of Lords, how long would it last, and what would become of the unfortunate suitors in the meanwhile? The easiest mode of rendering the tribunal of appeal efficient was the mode proposed by the Bill. He could only present it as "a mode of getting out of difficulties." A better course might be suggested; but the question was, could it be carried into practical operation? The House should not neglect a measure that would effect a great and required improvement.

Mr. Bowyer moved that the Bill should be read a second time that day six months. He inveighed against the measure, describing it "as an expedient to stop a clamour;" as falling short of the real evils requiring a remedy; as creating a new order of nobility—peers who would neither have seats in the House of Lords or be represented there; as bringing about

changes in the Constitution by enabling the House of Lords to sit during a prorogation; as, after all, creating an unsatisfactory tribunal and retaining the double appeal then existing. His suggestion was, that a supreme court of appeal should be established, consisting of five Judges—the best men who could be selected from the Bench or the Bar acquainted with the various laws of the empire, and sitting all the year round.

Mr. Robert Phillimore seconded the amendment. He looked upon the Bill, which had originated in a strange compromise of parties, as a hasty, ill-considered measure, that would only skim over the disease without curing it, and would, if carried, establish a court of judicature in the last resort alienated from the confidence and sympathy of the people.

Mr. Whiteside spoke in favour of the Bill, and taunted its opponents with having failed to suggest any other mode of avoiding the difficulty. He concurred in the principles, but not in some of the details, of the Bill.

Sir James Graham, at the outset of his speech, asked, "Have we arrived at that point, that we, the Commons of England, if we shall be satisfied with the judgment of the House of Lords as to the inefficient mode in which they now exercise their judicial functions, are to be told, when called upon to supply a remedy, that, though a co-ordinate branch of the Legislature, we are not to exercise our own judgment with respect to this remedy; and that we are to be coerced by the assertion of Her Majesty's Attorney-General that the House of Lords will not sur-

render its appellate jurisdiction, even though we should be of opinion that the time has arrived when a new tribunal should be created?" It might be possible to propose a better Bill: the House of Lords had inquired, and it was not unreasonable that the House of Commons should ask for time to inquire likewise.

The Bill came before them in a double aspect; it sought to dispose of a controversy as to peerages for life, and to remedy the deficiencies of appellate jurisdiction. With regard to the first, a compromise was a matter of necessity in order that the Government might be released from their life-peerage difficulty and the Opposition from their struggle with the Crown. But the House of Commons ought to view with jealousy a compromise based on mutual convenience. There was nothing new in it. In 1719, when the peerage question was last discussed in that House, a Bill moved by the Government and supported by the Opposition came down to the House of Commons. Sir Robert Walpole, united with his oldest opponents and opposed by its warmest partisans, met and defeated it with signal success. Sir Robert published a pamphlet on that occasion, and it contained a passage admirably illustrating the existing position of affairs. He said, "Amid all the numerous objections to this worthy scheme, I am free to own that there is one thing in it which deserves commendation, for it has produced a never-before-known unanimity among our great men. It has yoked the lion with the lamb—[I don't know whether we may not say the same of this Bill after the speeches of the honourable and learned Member for Enniskillen

and the honourable and learned Attorney-General] — the Whigs with the Tories, men in power with those they have turned out of it—[the honourable Member for Enniskillen sees some analogy already I imagine]—Ministers of State are become patriots, and join with their professed enemies in lessening that prerogative they have so often occasion for." Sir James continued his own remarks—"I am almost ashamed to quote a passage from another pamphlet, because it is not a pamphlet of Walpole, but of Sir Richard Steele, who took part in that great struggle, and who wrote a pamphlet called *The Plebeian*. He mentions a suspicion that certain great influences were afloat to carry the Bill, which had come down as a compromise from the other House; and he describes some nameless Member under the designation of Esau, whom he denounces as 'The greatest traitor to civil society that ever yet appeared, who shall contend for such a Bill in the Commons with the assurance in his pocket of being a peer as soon as the Bill passes.' I know not whether that passage is at all applicable to the present case; but there are suspicions which will, of course, be heard on all such occasions."

The Bill presented itself in two aspects; first, it disposed of the controversy as to peers for life; secondly, it upheld the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords. In respect to the first, which it had been admitted was the result of a compromise, the Bill, in his opinion, ought to excite the jealousy of the House of Commons, as to its object and the mode in which it was to be worked out, which exhibited the feebleness and

obscurity inherent in all middle measures. The 4th clause was especially obscure; according to his construction, it damaged the case of Lord Wensleydale, and placed him in a most ambiguous and anomalous position. The Bill, in his opinion, should either be rejected or referred to a Committee, for at present it left uncertain a great branch of the prerogative. He could not conceive anything more painful than the position of a peer for life, bearing a brand of dependence, a mark of inferiority, belonging to a class termed peers, but yet not *pares*, equal. He was satisfied that, if this Bill was adopted, it would be necessary to go on and to extend the creation of peers for life to the army, the navy, and politics, for poverty was not confined to the law. This touched the mainspring of human ambition, and he entreated the House to pause before it passed a measure which, for a comparatively paltry object, risked the swamping of the House of Lords. With respect to the other aspect of the Bill, the new appellate jurisdiction, it was, upon the face of it, he contended, a delusion, not a reality. This new tribunal was to sit during prorogation. What did that mean? Then the Judges were to be paid, and the second clause included some high legal personages. The Bill, in his opinion, would debauch both the Bench and the Bar. The Crown would have the power of holding out to Puisne Judges the prospect of an appointment as Deputy-Speaker in the House of Lords with a peerage for life, and the expectation of one of inheritance. It was competent to the House of Lords, without the intervention of the Commons, to mend their juris-

diction, which might be done by a distribution of the business, in classes, among the Judges. Things, however, could not go on, he observed, as they then were, and he referred to various cases which showed the imperfections of the existing appellate tribunal, and their bearing especially upon Scotch appeals. If legislation was necessary, it should be preceded, he thought, by careful inquiry, and, although prepared to reject the Bill, he preferred, on the whole, a Committee.

Mr. Roundell Palmer said, he should vote for the second reading of the Bill simply because, looking at the subject as one upon which legislation was absolutely necessary and ought not to be postponed, surrounded as the question was with difficulties, he still recognised in the principles of the Bill a mode of overcoming those difficulties less objectionable than any he had heard proposed, and, while he thought the details timid and imperfect, they were not beyond remedy in the committee. Upon the subject of life-peerages Mr. Palmer avowed his strong opinion to be that the Crown did possess the power of creating peers for life. He did not think, he said, that the prerogative of the Crown was invaded by the limitation which the Bill imposed to meet a practical difficulty, or that it would, as argued by Sir J. Graham, undermine the hereditary character of the peerage. He thought the Bill would be a barrier against the extension of life-peerages. In some of its details the Bill, he thought, was very defective; if passed in the form proposed, with only two Judges with the salary of Puisne Judges, it would be a miserable failure.

The Bill was further supported by Mr. Collier, and opposed by Mr. J. G. Phillimore.

Lord J. Russell observed that two great authorities who had spoken in favour of the Bill (the Attorney-General and Mr. Palmer) had made admissions not very favourable to it. He doubted whether a measure of that kind was required; whether it was wise to provide a permanent remedy for a temporary evil. He did not consider the appellate jurisdiction as exercised by the House of Lords to be so utterly a failure as some alleged, and, unless forced to look for a remedy, he should be satisfied with it as it was. But if he yielded to the two authorities he had referred to, in his opinion the remedy proposed in the Bill, instead of improving the tribunal, would make it worse. If there must be a remedy, let it be a complete and effectual one, not a hybrid court, neither a House of Lords nor a good appellate tribunal.

Touching on the question of life peerages, which he thought had been unnecessarily raised, Lord John asked whether the House of Lords intended to take away that prerogative which Lord Coke and a great many other authorities said the Crown possessed? Lord St. Leonards and Lord Campbell had said the Bill did take it away; Lord Lansdowne had said that it did not. Somebody proposed to insert words making the meaning of the Bill clear. But that would have left no subject of dispute in the House. Then they sent the Bill to the House of Commons, and asked the Commons to accept it in that ambiguous way, and make an Act of Parliament to continue two parties in the Upper

Chamber. "A more indecent measure, or a more unfit mode for Parliament to deal with the prerogative of the Crown, has never been brought forward." (*Loud cries of "Hear, hear!"*) For his own part, he believed that the Crown does possess the prerogative, but that the prerogative not having been exercised during the good times of the Constitution, he thought it would be fitting to lay down its exact limits. It would not, however, be advantageous to confine life-peerages to the profession of the law. "Upon the whole, I have come to the conclusion, that, although I see no immediate or pressing urgency (however much I may differ from others in that opinion) for any great reform in the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords—for I believe that the House of Lords could themselves make such changes as would render their court of appeal satisfactory to the country—still, if a change is to be made, I say, let us have a change which takes away the tribunal of appeal from the House of Lords altogether—(*loud cries of 'Hear, hear!'*)—and let us establish a tribunal which shall be complete in itself, and which shall consist not of the Puisne Judges, but of the most eminent men that can be found in the profession."

The Solicitor-General brought the debate to a close by a speech in favour of the Bill. The House of Lords, he said, did not usurp the appellate jurisdiction—nothing could be a greater mistake than to suppose so. The House of Lords had always possessed jurisdiction in writs of error and on questions of common law, and in 1685 they established their right to jurisdiction in equity. At the present

time the state of the appellate tribunal was unsatisfactory. Deputy-Speakers were formerly appointed to increase the judicial strength of the House of Lords; and it was only proposed to make that perpetual which had been formerly resorted to on a few occasions. As to the question of life-peerages, the power of the Crown to create life-peers had never been questioned. The question was simply, whether peers for life could sit and vote in the House of Lords. Coke's dictum might be taken as an assertion of the acknowledged right of the Crown, without reference to the constitutional right of a peer so created to sit and vote. That right was determined by a Committee of Privileges. The Bill did not affect the prerogative at all, except to limit it; and such limitation was perfectly constitutional. It would be rash to reject that Bill because it contained that limitation. The House of Commons, he hoped, would shrink from reopening a question already settled, and thus prevent the concord between the House of Lords and the Crown.

On a division the amendment was negatived by 191 to 142; and the Bill was read a second time.

Notwithstanding this success, the Bill was shortly afterwards lost in the Commons. On the 10th of July, Mr. R. Currie, upon the motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee upon the Bill, moved that it should be referred to a Select Committee, and another debate followed. In the course of a vigorous speech in opposition by Mr. Gladstone, he observed, as to the prerogative, how does the Bill deal with that? It says, that "not more than four persons shall have seats in the

House of Lords at one time as peers for life only." Could the English language more clearly express a declaration that the number of four life-peers was to be the absolute maximum fixed by law. But if it were meant to preserve the right of appointing life-peers, why not say so, instead of leaving the point ambiguous. There could not be a graver question than that of life-peerages. It had been inconsiderately raised, but that was no reason why it should be inconsiderately fastened down by legislation. The House of Commons had a right to ask for time to deliberate. The measure dealt with the question in subserviency to the question of a court of appeal. There was no inevitable relation between the two questions—one ought not to be made the victim of the other. Then it was proposed to make the House of Lords a pensioner on the public purse: the House of Lords would suffer indignity from the adoption of such a principle. The independence of that House would be most secure so long as all its functions were discharged gratuitously. It was hardly too much, under the circumstances, to ask the Government to consent that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee.

Lord Palmerston, in defence of the Bill, remarked, with respect to the appellate jurisdiction, he should be sorry to see it transferred from the House of Lords. On the question of life-peerages, he thought that House had acted on an erroneous judgment in excluding Lord Wensleydale, but he denied that the Bill was the result of a compromise huddled up in a Committee for the convenience of parties. It was a compromise

arising from the conflict of opinions. The Bill was the best possible arrangement for reinforcing the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords. The Deputy-Speakers were not to be paid for the exercising of their legislative but for their judicial functions ; and Mr. Gladstone might as well object to paying the Lord Chancellor as to paying Deputy-Speakers.

“ A great deal has been said as to the effect of the Bill upon the prerogative of the Crown. It is manifest, I think, to anybody who reads the Bill, that it acknowledges the prerogative, and limits it ; that, on one side, those who object to life-peerages have acknowledged the prerogative of the Crown to create them, and on the

other, those who maintain the prerogative have consented to a limitation for the purpose of establishing the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords on a satisfactory basis.”

Mr. Roebuck, not satisfied with this statement, appealed to the law-officers of the Crown for their legal opinion as to the effect of the Bill on the prerogative.

The Solicitor-General said, that if such a prerogative existed, then, beyond question, the Bill limited that prerogative.

On a division, Mr. Currie's amendment was carried by 155 to 133.

The result was received with much cheering by the opponents of the Bill. The practical effect was to stop its further progress.

CHAPTER V.

International Maritime Law—Debate in the House of Lords upon Lord Colchester's Resolutions condemnatory of the Policy that "A Neutral Flag covers an Enemy's Goods"—The Earls of Carnarvon, Hardwicke, and Derby speak in favour of, and the Earls of Clarendon, Albemarle, Harrowby, and Grey, and the Duke of Argyll against, the Motion—It is negatived upon a Division—Motion by Mr. Napier in the Commons proposing the Appointment of a Minister of Justice—His Speech—He is supported by Mr. Collier, Mr. Locke King, Mr. Wigram, Lord John Russell, and others—Mr. Baines, Sir G. Grey, Lord Palmerston, and Mr. Roundell Palmer also state their views—The same subject alluded to by Lord Brougham in the House of Lords in his Speech relative to Judicial Statistics—In the House of Lords the Lord Chancellor calls attention to the Consolidation of the Statute Law—County Police Bill introduced by Sir G. Grey—Jealousy against the measure—Debate on the Second Reading—It is opposed by Sir G. Pechell, Sir J. Walmsley, Mr. W. J. Fox, Mr. Muntz, Mr. Deeds, Mr. Hadfield, Mr. Cobbett, Mr. Henley, and others, Mr. Pack, Mr. Bentinck, Sir W. Heathcote, Sir H. Stracey, and Mr. Cayley support the Bill, which ultimately becomes law—Bishops of London and Durham Retirement Bill is introduced in the Lords by the Chancellor—It is much opposed by the Bishops of Exeter and Oxford, the Duke of Newcastle, the Earl of Derby, and Lord Redesdale—Letters showing the terms of the negotiation—Renewed opposition on the Third Reading, which is carried—The Bill is strongly opposed in all its stages in the House of Commons by Sir W. Heathcote, Lord R. Cecil, Sir James Graham, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Napier, Mr. Henley, Mr. Roebuck, and Mr. T. Duncombe—The chief speakers in its favour are Lord Palmerston, Mr. M. Milnes, Mr. Cardwell, Sir J. Shelley, Mr. Walpole, and Sir G. Grey—The Bill ultimately passes.

ON the 22nd of May, the House of Lords was the scene of a very important discussion on the subject of international maritime law. It arose upon the motion of Lord Colchester, who submitted to the House the following resolutions condemnatory of the declaration respecting maritime law signed by the Plenipotentiaries recently assembled in Congress at Paris:—

"That the most eminent jurists

of all ages have accepted as a principle of international law that the right of capturing an enemy's goods on board of neutral vessels is inherent in all belligerent Powers; that the maintenance of this right is of essential importance, and its abandonment of serious injury to a Power whose main reliance is on her naval superiority;

"That Great Britain conse-

quently — although occasionally waiving the exercise of the right by specific treaties—has invariably refused to recognise the abandonment of a principle which successive Governments have concurred in considering identified with her national greatness;

“That this House deeply regrets that a principle so long and so strenuously maintained should, in the recent conferences at Paris, have been suddenly abandoned, without the previous sanction or knowledge of Parliament, by plenipotentiaries assembled for the purpose of discussing the terms on which peace with Russia might be concluded, and the affairs of the East satisfactorily adjusted.”

The declaration, he said, laid down four principles. It was chiefly to the second of these that he wished to draw the attention of the House. It stated that a neutral flag should thenceforth cover our enemies' goods unless they were contraband of war. That was a principle contrary to the existing law of nations as laid down by American and English lawyers, and never admitted by England except in treaties where the principle of securing neutral goods in enemy's ships was also inserted. This was a surrender of an important right which this country had always possessed and maintained successfully; in arguments against the Prussian memorial in 1782—by arms against the northern confederacy in 1801—and by the orders in council of 1807-9. The declaration he was convinced would tend to prolong wars. He objected to it also because the question was decided without previous reference to Parliament, and the whole matter arranged with unbecoming haste. Hereafter the

power of the Crown to assent to these changes might be called in question. The declaration might not be held binding in a court of law. The maritime law had been declared the law of the land, and it remained to be seen whether a British Plenipotentiary could sign away the law of the land without the consent of Parliament.

The Earl of Clarendon disputed the position laid down by Lord Colchester in the resolutions, that the honour and safety of England were involved in maintaining this right over neutral maritime Powers. It would be most unwise to maintain this right, when everything was changing around them; and when there had been constant changes in the mode and stringency of the exercise of the right itself, against which all the maritime states of the world had always protested. Jurists had certainly declared it legal, but jurists generally dwelt more on what was law than on what the law ought to be. There were jurists as old as Grotius who defended the right, in time of war, of killing women and putting prisoners to death. They ought no more to rely on the opinions of jurists who defended such barbarities than on the opinions of many eminent lawyers in this country who had equally defended the worst portions of our criminal code. But there were many distinguished jurists who had disputed the right,—such as Pardessus, De Rayneval, Martens, Hubner, and Wheaton. A belligerent had an undoubted right to blockade an enemy's ports, and to prevent him receiving munitions of war. If a neutral broke the blockade, or supplied the enemy with warlike stores, he might justly be interfered with, because

by so doing he abandoned his character of neutral; but if he complied with the fully-recognised conditions, they had no further power over him. It was against this right alone that all maritime states had protested. During the last century there had been 133 international engagements, and in all of them, except 11, the right had practically been abandoned. It was not a question of law but of policy. In a great war England was rarely neutral, but America, now an important maritime Power, was considered the protector of all neutral states. In former wars the marine of America was comparatively small; at the beginning of the present war it exceeded 5,000,000 tons; America would not submit to our exclusive law. The order in council issued at the commencement of hostilities with Russia was most favourably received by all neutral Powers, and preserved to England their good-will. There was no probability that the character of any future war would be changed, or that they should revert to harsher principles; and after that declaration it would be dangerous to reverse this milder policy. He believed that declaration was justified by the law of nations, which was founded on the dictates of reason and justice, and the common assent of the civilised states of the world. As to the manner in which the convention had been made, it was a recognised principle of the constitution that the Crown had the full power of concluding all treaties; if a treaty could not be concluded without the previous sanction of Parliament, he believed no treaty would ever be concluded at all; a dozen negotiators had not found it an easy matter in the re-

cent case; if a thousand had been consulted it would have been impossible. Of all the treaties of the last century by which the right had been abandoned, there was not one on which Parliament had been consulted. The Plenipotentiaries had acted on the great precedent of the convention by which the slave-trade was denounced and suppressed. Had they confined themselves strictly to those matters which affected Russia, they would have lost a great opportunity of settling many important questions; nothing would have been said of the affairs of Italy, nor of the principle of mediation, by the discussion of which he believed a new obstacle had been placed in the way of war. England had abandoned with signal success many exclusive rights once thought essential to her greatness; she had abandoned the system of protection and privileges for her mercantile marine; and by abolishing the practice of privateering she had acted on sound policy, and done much to reduce the miseries and barbarities of a war.

The Earl of Carnarvon supported the resolution. He did not see that abolishing privateering had anything to do with concession to neutrals. Lord Clarendon had not attempted to answer the question, what was the value of this declaration of maritime law? In any future war, should we have to incorporate it into orders in council, or obtain for it the sanction of Parliament? The question was not one as to rights of neutrality, but as to the protection of enemies' property, and the principle involved was simply one of self-preservation and legitimate self-defence. We debarred the neutral only from those advan-

tages that would operate to our own detriment. Chatham, Pitt, and even Fox, the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel, were all opposed to the policy that a "neutral flag covers an enemy's goods." He was not very sanguine as to any reciprocal advantage which this country might obtain as a neutral power, for since the revolution of 1688 there had scarcely been a great war in Europe in which England had not borne a share. As to the manner in which the convention had been concluded, he thought it showed a want of candour, fairness, and straightforward dealing in not giving Parliament some intimation of the great revolution contemplated. For his own part, he sincerely regretted the change that had taken place and the manner in which it had been effected. He believed there was not a Member of that House who would not give his most cordial assent to any practical measure which promised to alleviate the horrors of war; but so long as war was regarded as the *ultima ratio* of nations, it was impossible that it should be unaccompanied by sorrow and desolation. In the words of a great statesman, the co-existence of a military war and a commercial peace were self-contradictory.

The Earl of Harrowby contended that England had suffered more injury from the practice of privateering than she had ever been able to inflict by the same means. He defended the course of the Government:

The Earl of Hardwicke thought the effect of the article of the convention might prove very disastrous hereafter; as an Englishman he regretted that conditions so de-

rogatory to the honour of England should have been accepted at Paris under French influence.

The Earl of Albemarle could see no distinction between an enemy's property on neutral territory, which could not be seized, and in a neutral ship, which made it liable to seizure. The law, he believed, was what Grotius and Vattel stated it; but it was not justice; and when they wrote there was not an Anglo-Saxon people on the western shores of the Atlantic, numbering almost as many millions as that on the eastern. It had not been proved that any injury would be sustained by the abolition of the right of search. On the contrary, former attempts to enforce it had greatly injured the commerce of this country, and France had had to pay a million sterling to America as an indemnity for losses caused by the French exercise of the right of search. He thought the convention an advance in civilisation. He should vote against the resolutions.

The Duke of Argyll said the policy of the Government was fully approved by the commercial interests of the country, on which its naval supremacy was founded. The more he considered the subject the more firmly he was convinced they lost nothing, and gained much, by the present convention. The principle of the right of search had been contested by many eminent jurists, and no jurist had asserted that the right was just and equitable. The law of nations was made by the practice of nations, and that did not allow the seizure of enemy's property on a neutral territory. The right of establishing a blockade was sufficient against all the na-

tions with which war was possible. England gave up a right it never could fully exercise, and retained every power required to carry on war effectually.

The Earl of Derby thought that the Duke of Argyll, who generally addressed the House with a considerable degree of confidence in his own opinions, had just spoken with rather more than his usual share of that great parliamentary virtue, but with rather less than his usual success. Now he (the Earl of Derby) did not deny the power of the Crown to conclude any treaty without the sanction of Parliament, but he wished to know what this declaration signed by Lord Clarendon really was. Was it an authoritative exposition of the law—not of that which should be the law? He drew a distinction between a treaty settling the course of action between two nations and an act placing the Government in the position of an exponent of the international law of Europe. Such an act might be within the prerogative of the Crown, but it was a gross and flagrant abuse of that prerogative, and, if not illegal, certainly anything but constitutional. The noble Earl was proceeding with his argument relative to the question of international law, and alluding to an expression of contempt for Grotius used by Lord Clarendon, when—

The Duke of Argyll, with much warmth, cried out: I never said anything of the kind. (*Loud laughter.*)

The Earl of Derby: I entreat the noble Duke to believe that I am not always talking of him. (*Loud laughter.*) When I speak of another person it does not follow that it is he who is present to my

thoughts. (*Continued laughter.*) I stated most distinctly that it was to the noble Earl the Foreign Secretary that I was alluding. (“Hear, hear!”)

The Earl of Derby then continued to point out that of all the authorities quoted by Lord Clarendon there was not one who did not recognise as a portion of the national law of Europe, “that enemy’s goods on board neutral ships were liable to capture.” It was a *nemo dubitat* maxim. Lord Mansfield, Vattel, Pitt, Grenville, and Canning had strenuously opposed any claim of immunity for a neutral flag. “It is now said that if we determine to support this doctrine we should be alone. We have been alone, and yet maintained and upheld the doctrine against a confederacy of opponents. (*Cheers.*) Yet this principle of belligerent right has been abandoned by the Government. I know not on what grounds; but this I know, that it has been abandoned without the sanction or consent of the people of this country. (‘Hear, hear!’) A noble Lord has objected to the wording of the motion, because it would condemn the conduct of foreign Plenipotentiaries as well as that of our own. Now, we do not presume to condemn the conduct of foreign Plenipotentiaries, who may have acted wisely in their generation, and rightly for the interests of their country. (‘Hear, hear!’) But what we deal with is the conduct of the English Plenipotentiary in respect to English interests. (‘Hear, hear!’) Let the noble Earl say what he pleases about the importance of England taking the first and primary position in this work of humanity, I beg to remind

him that England did not take the first step, but followed in the wake of France. ('Hear, hear!') It was the proposal of the French Plenipotentiary, and I should have liked to see what arguments were used by the noble Earl, and what conditions were made for the surrender of this right. In this matter, I repeat, we followed in the wake of France, to which country the adoption of the new principle is eminently favourable." ("Hear, hear!") The noble Earl then quoted the opinions of Mr. Pitt in 1801, who characterised the intention of the Northern Confederacy to produce a new code of maritime laws, as "a violation of public faith, a violation of the rights of England, and imperiously calls upon Englishmen to resist it even to the last shilling and the last drop of blood rather than tamely submit to degrading concessions, or meanly yield the rights of the country to shameful usurpation." Lord Hawkesbury said such pretensions were irreconcilable with the true principles of public law, and struck at the foundations and greatness of the maritime power of England. Lord Shelburne and Canning held the same opinions, and he (Lord Derby) was willing to class himself with such "barbarians who knew nothing of international law." If this principle were admitted in the case of neutral flags carrying cargoes, it must be extended to merchant ships of every class. As to treaties concluded during this century in which the right of search was not pressed, it was nothing in favour of the present concession, for it was one thing to waive a right and another to give it up *in toto*. The question was really most important. "Suppose, which

God forbid, that a war should arise between this country and France, what means have you of opposing France, except closing her up hermetically and stopping her commerce? Well, what are you to do? You can't blockade the whole coast of France; but you can practically prevent her from sending out one single bale of merchandise. Your new law permitting French goods to go with impunity on board neutral vessels comes into operation; you have no blockade. France gives up her whole commercial marine; she makes her vessels into vessels of war; she has seamen to man them; and, before your very face, she carries on her whole commerce under the Prussian or American flag. (*Cheers.*) You are powerless. Your power is gone. Your right arm is cut off. Your only means of defence are abandoned, and abandoned too at the suggestion of France. ('Hear!') Was there ever a Member so led by the nose? (*Cheers.*) Was there ever a Minister who so deliberately walked into the trap set before his face, and so tamely and gratuitously surrendered the foundation of England's greatness? (*Loud cheers.*) If I stood alone I would support the resolutions of my noble friend—I would divide the House upon this question—I would give to every one of your Lordships the power of recording your opinion as to the policy, the wisdom, and the safety of these proceedings. But, for my part, I solemnly protest—as derogatory to the country, as inconsistent with its dearest interests, as fraught with danger to its future greatness and power—ay! and to its future safety—I protest against the abandonment of rights involved in that

which, with all respect for his personal qualities, I cannot but characterise as the miserable Clarendon-Capitulation of Paris." (*The noble Lord resumed his seat amidst loud cheers.*)

Earl Grey thought the best way of testing the value of the right of search was to ask how it had worked. It had been found almost impossible to ascertain what was the property of an enemy in neutral ships. The difficulty felt in the war of the French Revolution was extreme; but with the present development of commerce the system would, in practice, be intolerable. The right was always so evaded that it was worthless as a means of injuring the enemy; and to make it efficient they would actually be compelled to make war with the whole world. They should look at the question uninfluenced by feelings of national pride, and as sober statesmen. This he thought the Earl of Derby had not done in the eloquent and effective commonplaces of his speech. The attempt to enforce the policy of which this right was a part had caused the greatest disasters both to England and France; the war Napoleon declared on commerce by his Berlin decrees embroiled him with Russia, roused the hatred of Germany against him, and was the ultimate cause of his ruin. He approved the convention, as based on a better and more humane policy.

Earl Granville read a letter from Lord Chief Justice Campbell (detained judicially at the Central Criminal Court, by the trial of William Palmer), expressing his opinion—"That the modification of the law of maritime warfare is beneficial to England, and was constitutionally

entered into by the English Government."

The House then divided, when there appeared—For the motion, Content (56 present, 46 proxies), 102; against the motion, Not-Content (88 present, 68 proxies), 156; majority against the resolutions, 54.

On the 12th of February, the subject of a Minister of Justice was brought before the House of Commons by Mr. Napier, in redemption of a promise given by him during the preceding Session. He moved a resolution:—

"That, in the opinion of this House, as a measure of administrative reform, provision should be made for an efficient and responsible department of public justice, with a view to secure the skilful preparation and proper structure of Parliamentary bills, and promote the progressive amendment of the laws of the United Kingdom."

He said, that while arts and manufactures were materially improving, the framing of laws was left without improvement, and yet it was a matter which was not isolated or departmental, but one in which the whole community had an interest. The subject might be divided into three branches: the actual state of things, remedies tried without success, and the remedy he then proposed. The present state of the law was disgraceful to a civilised country. There were actually three systems of legislation in progress for England, Ireland, and Scotland. Scotland minded her own affairs; she did not trouble the House much; she was very much of a self-supporting country. But with Ireland the case was different. Parliament had not given her the full

benefit of the Act of Union. Instead of identic legislation, an ineffective, a special, and distinctive system, for the most part set in motion after midnight, had been applied to Ireland. Between England and Ireland there were no fewer than 18,284 statutes; thirty-six volumes of English, and nineteen volumes of Irish, statutes. Before the Union, there were 2263 statutes passed peculiar to Ireland, 1300 other statutes had been passed since the Union; and, besides these, by Poyning's Law, Ireland was subject to all acts passed down to the reign of Henry VII. Lord Bacon, writing at a time when there were only 2171 statutes, remarked, that "so great was the accumulation of statutes, so often did those statutes cross each other, and so intricate were they, that the certainty of the law was entirely lost in the heap." Yet the statutes passed during the reign of Queen Victoria outnumbered those contained in the entire statute-book as it stood in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. At the close of Queen Anne's reign, the statutes amounted to 3277; of which no fewer than 2074 had been wholly or partially repealed, had become obsolete, or had expired; and the recent expurgate list, for England alone, included 10,047 statutes. During last session, 134 Acts were passed, comprising 1005 pages; of which 92 only applied to the United Kingdom, 10 to Great Britain, 22 to England and Ireland, 102 to England, and 800 had no connection whatever with Imperial interests. Should this state of things continue? Take an example from the Justinian Code; it was perfected in less than four years. The Pandects and Insti-

tutes were completed in three years; and 3,000,000 sentences reduced to 150,000. The Code Napoléon was commenced in August, 1800, and completed by March, 1804. The New York Code was comprised in three octavo volumes. Lord Bacon proposed to consolidate and reform the law, by expurgating repealed, obsolete, unsuitable statutes. James the First supported the proposal; and in a speech to Parliament remarked, that this reformation might be made a "worthy work, and well deserved a Parliament to be sat of purpose for it." In 1787, Mr. Hargreave, the eminent jurist, adverting to the evils then to be remedied, asked, "Would Bacon and Hale have remained unconcerned spectators of the most dangerous of all juridical diseases?" In 1816, the evil was so greatly felt that a partial consolidation was effected; but since 1816, 4585 public statutes had been added to our code. In 1826, Sir Robert Peel consolidated the Criminal Code—"one of the greatest monuments of his practical statesmanship and ability which he had left behind." In 1833, a Commission appointed by Lord Brougham recommended a "complete and systematic consolidation, accompanied with an adjustment of the enactments to precedent and judicial decision," as "practicable and desirable." But nothing came of it. Much good advice had been offered; many persons had pointed out what ought to be done; but what was wanted was that *something* should be *done*. In 1853, the present Lord Chancellor laid before Parliament an admirable plan for consolidating the statute law; but the Commission then appointed had not succeeded in

doing the work that ought to be done. If they turned from the past to current legislation, they would see that the magnitude of the evil required that it should be grappled with at once. The same Bills were brought in over and over again; some Member of the Government got up and said—"I don't object to the honourable Member's introducing the Bill, but I don't pledge myself to the details." It was thought prejudicial to the interest of the Government to refuse permission to introduce; but then ensued a scrambling scene, and Government tried to trip up the Bill at some stage of its progress. Extraordinary mistakes were made, and Bills passed in one Session were amended and explained in the next, followed sometimes by further amendment, sometimes by repeal; of which, and of other sources of anomaly, Mr. Napier supplied instances.

The remedy would be found in a department, presiding over which should be a wise and enlightened man, having under him a proper staff, the duty of which it should be to watch the state of the law, to observe the working of the law, and to propound proper amendments; and then what was wanted by the people in the matter of law reform would be seasonably granted." When private Members introduced Bills, the department would be able to inform the House as to the existing law, and to advise whether the proposed plan should be adopted. Lord Bacon had described the *Sex Viri* at Athens as "standing commissioners to watch and discern what laws waxed improper for the time, and what new law did in any branch cross a former law, and so, *ex officio*, propounded their re-

peal." Lord Brougham, in 1848, urged the necessity of forming a board of skilful professional men, "not to supersede, but to aid both Houses of Parliament in the preparation of Public Bills." Lord Langdale told the Committee on Fees in Courts of Justice, that what was wanted was "an office of Government in which the affairs of justice should be the particular object of attention." "You cannot," he said, "work out a system of safe and rational law reform without an authority of that kind." Lord Lyndhurst said in the House of Lords, in 1853, "You should have a person of competent information, with proper assistance, to master every Bill, watch its progress, and communicate either as to its original state or amendments." Finally, the Statute Law Commissioners recommended a board or some other persons for a similar purpose. In enforcing these recommendations, Mr. Napier said that "commissions and committees, and amateur legislation, have been tried in vain." We must get rid of all that. There was a Board of Public Works, a Department of Public Health, a Board of Trade, a Department of War; it was proposed to establish a Department of Education; was not Justice entitled to have a department as much as any one of those?

He proposed that the new department should occupy itself with the amending of the old law, with the supervising of current legislation, and with watching the working of the laws. The Eastern fable apprised him that it was in the cleansing of the old lamp that the secret of its power was discovered; and he thought that if we worked in earnest we should be

able to summon to our aid what might be called the genii of the lamp. We should have voices from the dead to cheer us. We should have the voice of the enlightened Bacon, the just Hale, the noble and majestic wisdom of Romilly. We should have the aid of one who still survived—one to whom might be applied the language of his eloquent countryman—one who had “winged his flight against the blaze of every science with an eye that never winked and a wing that never tired”—Henry Lord Brougham, who, during a long life, had devoted himself to the cause of law reform, persevering to the end with a vigour and energy perfectly wonderful at his advanced age. (*Cheers.*)

Mr. Collier seconded the motion, and enforced the arguments of Mr. Napier. Mr. Locke King and Mr. Wigram also supported the resolutions. Mr. Baines, in the temporary absence of Sir G. Grey, and, shortly afterwards, Sir George himself, stated the view of the Government. The existing evils were admitted, and the only question was, what should the remedy be? Mr. Baines thought Mr. Napier's proposal was vague; and Sir George Grey hoped the House would not be asked to pledge itself to the appointment of a department headed by a Minister in that House—at least, not until the report of the Statute Law Commission had been laid before Parliament. They had devised a plan to carry out the objects shadowed forth in that passage of their last report where they said, that “perhaps nothing satisfactory towards the improvement of future legislation can be effected until either a board or some other persons are appointed,

whose duty it shall be either to prepare or revise and report upon all Bills before they are brought into Parliament, and to watch them during their progress through the two Houses, either as officers of the Lord Chancellor or some other Minister, or as officers of the two Houses of Parliament.” Sir George Grey thought, however, that many of the evils could not be remedied unless Parliament abandoned something of its free right of legislation and its arrangement of details. Inaccuracies were mostly made in Committees, and the House would regard with jealousy any attempt to control the right of making amendments. Deprecating haste, Sir George expressed a hope that Government would soon be able to take a decided step in the matter.

Lord John Russell did not think Mr. Baines was correct in stating that the motion was vague. It was as explicit as it could well be. It was not Mr. Napier's business to point out the details: it was his business to assert the principle, and this he had done. But after what had been stated by the Government, he did not see how the House could adopt the resolution of the two plans; that of Mr. Napier's and the one shadowed forth by the Government. Lord John Russell considered Mr. Napier's plan of a responsible Minister the most philosophical, the most practical, and the most conducive to the objects in view. Mr. Drummond, Mr. Ewart, and Mr. Wilkinson supported the resolutions. Mr. Malins admitted the necessity for an improvement, but should wait for the plan to be proposed by the Statute Law Commissioners.

Lord Palmerston characterised the subject as one of the deepest

importance; but he enlarged on the "difficulties" that attended it. Much doubt might be entertained whether the appointment of a Minister of Justice would prevent errors. Neither House of Parliament should abdicate its functions, nor would individuals yield to the dictum of such an officer. They would maintain their opinions; the House would often back them; and the Minister would be in a minority. The difficulties and delays experienced in passing Bills did not arise from the want of a Minister of Justice, but from the great diversity of opinions always opposed to any great improvement in the law. Delays were not so much caused by obstacles to the framing of good measures as by the difficulty of persuading Parliament to adopt them. He hoped that, as the Statute Law Commissioners had a proposal under consideration, Mr. Napier would waive his resolution for the present, reserving to himself the right to bring it forward later in the session should he not be satisfied with the labours of the Commission.

Mr. Roundell Palmer opposed the adoption of the resolution, and the proposal to appoint a Minister of Justice. The Government was not without a Minister of Justice; for it was in that capacity that the Lord Chancellor sat in the Cabinet. No new Minister of Justice could be appointed without disturbing the present position of the Lord Chancellor, of the Attorney-General, and to a great extent the Home Secretary. It would be better to obtain the ends desired by improving what they already possessed, than by venturing on so strange an innovation as the creation of another Cabinet Minister. The House would act most prudently

by resting satisfied with the great advantage that could not fail to follow from the discussion, and decline to commit itself to the resolution.

Mr. Napier then replied, and having consented to strike out that part of his motion which pledged the House to the establishment of a new department in the State, the resolution was agreed to.

The subject was also alluded to by Lord Brougham in the House of Lords, on the 3rd of March, when, in relation to the subject of judicial statistics, he moved for returns from the Criminal, Civil, Admiralty, Ecclesiastical, and Bankruptcy Courts. The speech with which he introduced his motion contained much valuable information upon the subject. The question, he observed, was one of the greatest importance, and comprised a detail of the whole working of the law, whether in a court of justice or out of it. Through want of the statistics called for, they were left in ignorance how far it might be proper to make new laws, or to modify or repeal old laws. At the Statistical Congress held at Brussels in 1853, one of the sections was devoted to judicial statistics; and a similar Congress was held two months afterwards in Paris under the presidency of the Minister of Public Works. That Congress was attended on the part of England by Dr. Farr, Mr. Fonblanque, and Professor Leoni Levi, and these gentlemen had strongly recommended that a similar Congress should be held in London, or at all events that complete judicial statistics should be laid before the country.

There were great defects in the judicial statistics of this country. Before 1839 the returns were better, but little better, than they

were now. Then they set forth the age and sex of the prisoner; but in 1850 a mock saving of a few pounds was effected by suppressing the sex of the prisoner! Even before 1839, no return was made of the number of offences; and thus, although several persons might be implicated in one murder, they would all appear in the returns as implicated in separate offences. Another defect in our returns was, that they did not give the proportion of crime to population. That was not the case in France. There it was ascertained that there was an average of one criminal in 4568. In the department of Aisne, the proportion was one in 10,000; in the department of the Seine, one in 1380; and in the department of Corsica, one in 1672; the most refined and the least refined departments meeting at the bottom of the list. Our returns did not give the length of incarceration, nor the difference between the commitment, trial, and end of the proceedings; in the French returns all these facts were set forth. We kept no account of the offences which led to no apprehension, or were never brought to trial. The importance of such statistics was shown by the fact that the Constabulary Commission of 1839 were obliged to issue between 200 and 300 queries to the departments in order to obtain information which any person in France could have obtained in 24 hours. To show the necessity of not confining our inquiries to objections, or even commitments, he stated that the commissioners found the number of forgeries committed in the years 1816-17 was 28,000, and the convictions only 110; while in 1820-21 the number was 24,000, and 240 con-

victions. These commissioners, if they had confined their attention to the convictions, would have concluded that the crime had increased to double the amount; whereas there had been a diminution of committals, although the convictions had doubled. Again, in the course of twenty years, from 1806 to 1826, the number of convictions was doubled, and the offences had fallen down to one-half. The means of acquiring that kind of information exist in Ireland. For instance, in 1852, there were, in Dublin, 60,886 offences, of which only 54,261 came into Court; so that one-tenth of the whole number never would have appeared in any record kept on the principle then pursued in this country. The number discharged was 40,000 and odd, and those that were committed for trial was less than one-third of the whole. The French returns of 1853 gave the number of crimes and of persons: the number of crimes amounted to 213,000, the number of persons to 268,000. They also distinguished between the rural and town districts. We had no information on the ticket-of-leave system; but in France they had full information. Now, what chance would there have been that all the defects in the Court of Chancery would have gone on generation after generation if we had exhibited in that correct, intelligible, and striking form in which the French exhibit their returns, the results of the various suits pending in that Court for years past?

It was true that Lord Brougham and many others had brought in various measures for the improvement of the law; but, owing to the want of information on the subject, and owing also in no small degree

to there being no Minister of Justice, whose duty it would be to take charge of such Bills, their progress had been impeded, and their final passing delayed year after year. He could speak positively as to that being the effect produced, from his own experience of the marvellous difference in the progress of the Bills which he presented when he had the honour to sit on the Woolsack, and of those which he had presented since he had ceased to hold that office. In the year 1845 he presented nine Bills, every one of which ought then to have been passed into law, and the majority of which had since passed, including that most blessed change by which parties were allowed to be examined as witnesses. That was introduced in 1845, and when was it passed? In 1851—a delay of six years and a-half—making six years and a-half of misdecisions, of mistrials, of injury to parties, of suppression of the truth, and of the triumph of falsehood; and all because the Bill had not been brought in by a person of official weight. He could mention other Bills which had met with the same prejudicial delay, but he would only name one—the Bill for abolishing the Masters' Office, admitted on all hands to be a most useful and valuable measure; and yet it was not till ten years after that Bill was first propounded that it was suffered to pass. That could not have happened in France, because they would have had all the information upon which an opinion could be formed produced year after year, and represented to the Government by the Minister of Justice, so that it would have been absolutely and utterly impossible that the abuse could have been allowed

to exist for that period of time. He called attention to another very important subject illustrated in these returns—namely, that of reconciliation. No greater benefit could be conferred on the people of this country than the establishment of a system which would make parties go before a Judge—a person of character, experience, ability, and wholly uninterested—and take the advice of that person upon the question referred to him. He knew that in some countries where such an arrangement had been tried, four-fifths of the causes had been settled in this way. In France the system did not work so well, but it still produced a good effect: out of 211,000 causes, a reconciliation took place in 154,000, or in three-fourths. But there was another Bureau de Conciliation—he meant the Conseil de Prud'hommes. As was known, these were men of respectability appointed to arbitrate in all disputes between masters and workmen, chiefly in the manufacturing districts. The result was, that in the last year to which these returns refer, out of 28,000 such disputes, all but 1041 were settled by this tribunal, and of the latter number more than one-half never went further, but were soon afterwards settled without coming into Court. At St. Etienne, a great manufacturing town, out of 2818 cases all were settled but 70, which was as if at Birmingham all but one-fortieth part of the disputes between masters and workmen had been amicably and comfortably settled, so as to heal the differences between employers and employed.

With regard to bankruptcy we happened to have accurate returns, because we had a Commission sit-

ting two or three years ago; but that was an accident, and at the present moment no such information was procurable. Here again the French had admirable returns.

After some observations by the Lord Chancellor as to the importance of the subject, the resolutions were laid on the table.

On the 21st of July the Lord Chancellor, in the House of Lords, called attention to the second report of the Commissioners for consolidating the statute law, and in doing so took the opportunity of communicating to the House some of the views and recommendations of the Commissioners.

The statutes of the realm, he said, were about fifteen thousand in number, and were comprised in forty folio volumes of small type. It had been determined to make a general classification of the statutes, and consolidate them under different heads—criminal law, law relating to property, and law relating to mercantile matters. It was found, however, that the work would be useless unless an improved mode of legislation were adopted in future; and they suggested the appointment of an officer who should advise on the legal effect of every Bill in both Houses, and on the state of the law affected by the Bill, its language, structure, and operation on the existing law: what it repealed or modified, what it left unrepealed and conflicting. The precedent for that appointment was the Examiner of Standing Orders, and the appointment of such an officer would obviate some of the grosser evils which attended the introduction of Bills both by private Members and the Government. A great portion of the statutes were not

law, but matters of temporary enactment—regulations of the army and navy, local regulations, and Acts relating to finance. Last year, 134 Acts passed, and 68 of these were temporary enactments. The whole legislation of the Session occupied 1005 pages, but of these only 363 pages were occupied by laws properly so called. By classifying the Bills into temporary Bills and Bills that laid down some general rule of conduct, the additions to the statute book would be diminished one-third. At the beginning of next Session, Government intended to appoint an officer of the kind indicated; and he hoped that both Houses would acquiesce in the appointment of a committee through whom that officer might communicate with them. During the past Session a number of Bills had been prepared; some he had not had time himself to look through, others had not been revised by the departments to which they related. The consolidation of the criminal law had been undertaken by Lord Wensleydale, the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, Sir Fitzroy Kelly, and Mr. Greaves. They had found, however, that they could not include in the consolidation offences connected with the bankruptcy and customs laws, and the laws relating to religion. With these exceptions, all the laws relating to indictable offences had been consolidated into six statutes, under the heads of offences of high treason, against public justice, against the person, of larceny and theft, of malicious injury to property, and of forgery. In two short Bills they had embodied the law relating to principal and accessory, and all the Acts relating to criminal proceeding. These mea-

asures must be accepted with much more confidence than when a Bill was introduced for the first time. The Commissioners thought that the law might be reduced from 15,000 to 300 Acts—some thought from 200 to 250; and that instead of occupying forty they would occupy four moderately-sized volumes.

The Lord Chancellor then laid one of the Bills on the table, and it was read a first time.

On the 4th of February Sir George Grey, in the House of Commons, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to render more efficient the police in counties and boroughs in England and Wales. The measure was introduced in fulfilment of a pledge which had been given by the Home Secretary that he would direct his attention to the subject during the recess. Sir George Grey entered into full explanations of the changes to be effected by and the general character of the measure, but as these were repeated and amplified by him on the 10th of March, when he proposed the second reading, and the Bill was then debated at considerable length, an unusually large number of Members taking part in the discussion, we shall confine our notice of the measure during its progress through Parliament to the occasion of the second reading, with this additional remark, that few measures were ever threatened by a more combined and formidable opposition; but happily for the interest of social order the good sense of Parliament triumphed over petty local influences and jealousies, and the Bill became law.

Sir George Grey began by stating that great misconception pre-

vailed as to the scope, object, and possible effect of the Bill, which he should endeavour to clear away. The Bill originated with the Committee of the House of Commons of 1853, appointed to inquire as to the expediency of establishing a uniform system of police in England and Wales and in Scotland. The witnesses examined were magistrates of counties and boroughs, chairmen of quarter-sessions, tenant-farmers, land-agents, heads of police, and influential Members of the House. The Committee made two reports: it showed that the County Constabulary Act had very beneficial results where it had been adopted; that the system of parish and superintending constables was totally inadequate for its objects; that the non-adoption of the County Constabulary Act in one part impeded the operation of the police in another part; and that the efficiency of the police was impaired by a want of co-operation between the forces in counties and boroughs. He brought forward many cases, with evidence and statements by Captain M'Hardy, superintendent of the Essex Constabulary; Mr. Blathwayte, magistrate for Gloucestershire, Somersetshire, Wiltshire, and Bath; Sir William Heathcote, the member for Oxford University; and other gentlemen. They showed that against the expense must be set the saving of property otherwise lost; the convenience to the poor—as in getting a summons executed by the policeman gratuitously, while the parish-constable requires half-a-crown; and the prevention of much disorder which did not amount to crime.

First, as to counties. The County Constabulary Act had not

been adopted in twenty counties and in two ridings of Yorkshire; and the progress of a regular police in the counties that had adopted it had been very gradual. Some counties had been forced to the adoption by the disasters arising from the want of a well-trained constabulary. Surrey, for example, became the refuge of the Frimley gang of housebreakers and murderers, who at last committed the atrocious murder of a clergyman in a very bold and open manner; and *then* the magistrates of Surrey established a county police force. The working of the present partial adoption was shown by Mr. Jonathan Peel, a magistrate residing near Clitheroë, in the West Riding of Yorkshire, in a letter to the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, in which he set forth the utter inefficiency of the parochial constables and the consequent insecurity of the public peace and of property in his neighbourhood.

Similar accounts were given in a petition from twelve acting magistrates of the county palatine of Lancaster, living on the borders of the West Riding of Yorkshire; by Lord Scarborough, writing from Rufford Abbey; and Mr. Wilson Overend, chairman of quarter-sessions at Sheffield.

As to boroughs. The Bill had been erroneously represented as infringing the rights of local self-government warranted by the Municipal Reform Act. That was not so. The Act contained provisions that returns should be sent to the Secretary of State, showing the number of policemen, the regulations, &c., with the object of bringing the efficiency of the police under the eye of the Secretary of State. Since that Act was passed,

laws had been enacted giving the Secretary of State supervision or control over prisoners, and throwing the expense of convicted prisoners and of the prosecution of offenders on the country at large. In the largest boroughs the police worked well; but in some of the secondary and in the smaller boroughs it was totally inefficient. Taking such boroughs as Ashton-under-Lyne, Berwick, Bolton, Coventry, Stockport, &c., there were from four to thirty-seven policemen in populations ranging from 15,000 to 70,000—numbers which alone showed how inadequate was the force. He quoted statements from the local officers of various boroughs, giving details. One letter was from a jeweller in Portsmouth, who stated that there were forty or forty-two constables for the towns of Portsmouth, Portsea, Landport, Mile End, Milton, Buckland, Tratton, and Southsea, with 80,000 inhabitants, and forty miles of gas-pipe. During one month, recently, the force was reduced by one-fifth, through death or disease: and within the walls of Portsmouth there were but four constables for day and night.

He explained over again the general character of the Bill, and stated the amendments that he should make. He showed that the Secretary of State's authority in the counties tended generally to promote the efficiency of the men, and to check the magistrates in entrusting them needlessly with weapons *more* formidable than a truncheon, or in fixing salaries so low that they must be eked out by fees. In boroughs much expense was saved by permitting the police to assist in conveying prisoners, inspecting weights and measures,

&c. He would, however, withdraw the joint power given to the Secretary of State for making regulations on that point, leaving it entirely to the Town-Council. He would withdraw the sixth clause, enabling the Secretary of State to check the regulations for boroughs on the subject of stature, pay, accoutrements, &c.; endeavouring to obtain similar securities by another plan.

In the debate which followed, the numerous opponents of the Bill for the most part based their objections to it as a stepping-stone in a system of centralization—as infringing upon the constitutional principle of local self-government and municipal rights, and of the absence of any necessity in the social condition of the country.

Mr. C. Foster moved that it be read a second time that day six months, which was seconded by Captain Scobell.

The intrusion on local government was opposed by Sir George Pechell, Sir Joshua Walmsley, Mr. W. J. Fox, Mr. J. B. Smith, Mr. Muntz, Mr. Eccles, and Mr. Hadfield. Mr. Barrow, Mr. Cobbet, and Mr. Knight also spoke in opposition.

Mr. Henley observed that when Parliament was about to make a system of police compulsory it ought to base its legislation, not upon opinions, but upon facts. The evidence taken by the Committee of 1853 he thought was defective in this respect, and he gave the results of a very comprehensive examination of criminal statistics. For the last fifteen years he compared four counties having a rural police with four counties without a rural police, the population and acreage being nearly the same, whence it ap-

peared that, in the latter there had been an increase of population without an increase of crime; and from other elements it resulted that the counties without a rural police were less prolific in criminals than those under the protection of such a force. With respect to the boroughs, he was not surprised, he said, at their apprehensions; after the late attack upon their money they were jealous of anything like an invasion of their franchises. He thought it was evident that it was the intention to give the conservation of the peace from the magistracy to the police, and the effect of such transfer of authority was seen where the Home Office had the power, as in the outrages in Hyde Park.

To this Sir W. Heathcote replied that he thought there was a fallacy in the argument drawn from criminal statistics. The real list being the amount of detected crime.

Sir H. Stracey, Mr. Packe, Mr. Bentinck, Mr. Rice, Mr. Warner, and Mr. Cayley, also supported the Bill. The House having divided, the amendment was negatived by 259 to 106, and the Bill read a second time.

Towards the close of the Session a measure was brought forward in the House of Lords which, from its novelty and importance, excited great interest. It was a Bill for permitting the retirement upon pensions of the Bishops of London and Durham. The Lord Chancellor, in moving the second reading of the Bill on the 15th of July, stated the circumstances under which the two prelates were desirous of being relieved from their arduous responsibilities, and explained the nature and provi-

sions of the Bill. He said that both Bishops had earnestly represented their incapacity to discharge their duties. The Bishop of London suffered a severe paralytic attack last autumn; the Bishop of Durham was very advanced in life, and nearly blind. They both desired to resign. The Bill before the House was to enable them to do so. Now, although their resignations might perhaps be effected without the aid of Parliament, yet, as the law was obscure, and as no precedent could be found since the Reformation, it would have been unwise to attempt to carry out the wishes of the two Bishops without the consent of Parliament. The bishopric of London was not what was called a "regulated" bishopric, but the Bishop drew the whole of the revenue, which might be estimated at 18,000*l.* per annum. If the bishopric had been regulated, the income would have been fixed at 10,000*l.*; there would therefore be no difficulty in providing a handsome allowance for the retiring Bishop, and still leave a surplus for the Ecclesiastical Fund. The retiring allowance would be 6000*l.*; one-half of which would be expended in keeping up insurances which the Bishop, not having saved money, had effected on his life as a provision for his family. The case of the Bishop of Durham was different: Dr. Maltby had accepted the see on the assumption that it would yield a net income of 8000*l.* a year; the income exceeded that sum by 5000*l.*, and the Bishop had set apart the surplus to form a fund for the benefit of the diocese, called the "Maltby Fund." A charge on the revenue for a retiring allowance [amount not mentioned] would leave a surplus for

the Ecclesiastical Fund. Any resignation of a benefice must be accompanied by a declaration that there had been no corrupt bargain; but there could be nothing less open to the imputation than the surrender of large incomes in these cases.

A considerable opposition was manifested to the motion by Lord Redesdale, the Bishop of Exeter, the Earl of Derby, the Duke of Newcastle, and the Bishop of Oxford. One great objection was, that a general measure had not been introduced to regulate the retirement of Bishops and the clergy. It was urged that it would be better to bear the inconveniences of a few months' delay than set the dangerous precedent of exceptional legislation. The Bishop of Exeter regarded the Bill as an infringement of Church principles—especially of the sacred rule that a Bishop can only resign to the Archbishop, who gave him admission. He also complained that the Episcopal Bench had not been consulted. The Bishop of Oxford asked the House to pause before it applied a palliative that would render a general measure to remedy the evil next to impossible. The Earl of Derby said, the Bill violated the law of England, which prohibits anything in the way of traffic or bargain in the resignation of any office. Negotiations were entered upon with the Bishops, and that negotiation was of the kind strictly prohibited by the law of England. The Duke of Newcastle said, it was well known that there were two other prelates in the same position as the Bishops of Durham and London: why were they not dealt with? They had not resigned because they knew the

House of Commons would not grant pensions out of the Ecclesiastical Fund. The present proposal was degrading to the Church and injurious to the Bishops. Lord Redesdale moved that the Bill should be read a second time that day three months.

The original motion was supported by the Earl of Chichester, the Earl of Harrowby, and the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Archbishop expressed his surprise at the opposition which proceeded from friends of the Church. Nothing could be less consistent with the interests of religion than to leave the dioceses of London and Durham without episcopal superintendence for an indefinite period. The resignation of a Bishop for sufficient cause was a recognised part of the constitution of the Church. No doubt, a general measure on the subject was highly desirable; but no future Bishop would be in the position of those who were the subjects of that Bill. The amount of the retiring allowance of the Bishop of London had been called "extreme;" but if the Bishop had spared one-half of what he employed in charities, he would have been independent of the Bill.

On a division, the amendment was negatived by 47 to 35; and the Bill was read a second time.

On the order for going into Committee, Lord Redesdale submitted to the Government, that the Bill ought not to be proceeded with until the correspondence with the Bishops had been produced. The Lord Chancellor said that there was not the slightest reluctance to lay it on the table. No doubt it would be laid on the table. The letters would show that the Bishops did not suppose

they were doing anything simoniacal.

The Bishop of Oxford said that was not a correct statement of the case. The Government ought to state distinctly whether the Bishop of London knew it to be an act of simony which they were going to lead him to do. The Bishop of London understood that this private Bill would be accompanied by a general measure. That general measure was dropped; yet, taking advantage of a change of circumstances, the Government were going to make the Bishop guilty of simony in the eyes of the great body of the Church. Lord Campbell explained, that simony was doing a thing prohibited by law, without the consent of the Legislature. But here the consent of the Legislature was asked. Whether the Bill pass or not, there would be no simony, either legal or moral, in the matter. The Bishop of Oxford rejoined, that if the Bill passed, the two Bishops would not be legally guilty of simony, but the same thing that they do will remain illegal in other cases.

The Earl of Chichester stated that the Bishop of London had seen and approved of the draught of a Bill, not exactly similar to that before the House, but the same in principle in respect of its being a separate measure. The Earl of Shaftesbury described the prospective state of the diocese of London as it would be under an interregnum, and urged the House to go on with the Bill. The Earl of Derby supported the views of the Bishop of Oxford.

The House went into Committee without dividing. The Earl of Galloway and Lord Dungannon strongly objected to the enormous

retiring allowances—£6000 to the Bishop of London, £4500 to the Bishop of Durham. But the Bill passed through Committee without amendment in these respects.

As a good deal of discussion ensued during the subsequent stages of the Bill, relative to the correspondence between the two Bishops and the Premier, and the amount as well as terms of the negotiations which had taken place, the letters themselves are here given.

*The Lord Bishop of London to
Viscount Palmerston.*

“Fulham Palace, June 18, 1856.

“My dear Lord—I think it proper to communicate to your Lordship my desire, on account of continued illness, if allowed by law, to resign the bishopric of London, upon being secured the enjoyment, during my life, of a clear annuity of £6000. If this proposal should be approved by your Lordship, I trust that you will take proper measures for carrying it into effect.

“I have the honour to be, my dear Lord, your Lordship’s very faithful servant,

“C. J. LONDON.”

*Viscount Palmerston to the Bishop
of London.*

“Piccadilly, June 19.

“My dear Lord—I have to acknowledge the communication of your wishes to resign your see on the conditions mentioned by you; and I will take steps to carry your wishes into effect.

“My dear Lord, yours faithfully,
PALMERSTON.”

*The Lord Bishop of Durham to
Viscount Palmerston.*

“4, Upper Portland Place,
June 21.

“My Lord—In consequence of the great failure of my sight, and

other infirmities incident to a very advanced age, I am anxious, if allowed by law, to be relieved from the fatigue and responsibility of the high office which I have now enjoyed for the last twenty years. As I shall relinquish a very much larger income, I am persuaded that your Lordship will not consider the annual allowance of £4500 per annum by any means unreasonable. Upon the assurance that this will be granted, I shall be ready to resign the bishopric of Durham on any day not earlier than the 1st of August.

“I could have wished to name a later day, for I fear it will not be in my power to complete arrangements for leaving Auckland at so early a day; but Lord Chichester informed me that it might be inconvenient to the Government. I therefore acquiesced, in the confidence that I should not be hurried unnecessarily; and it may possibly be desirable that my successor, whoever he may be, should have an opportunity of conferring with me, before I leave Auckland, upon the state of the diocese.

“I have the honour to be, my Lord, your most obedient servant,

“E. DUNELM.”

*The Lord Bishop of London to
Viscount Palmerston.*

Fulham Palace, 23rd June, 1856.

“My dear Lord—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordship’s letter of the 19th instant, and to express my obligation for your prompt acquiescence in my proposal.

“I remain, my dear Lord, your very faithful servant,

“C. J. LONDON.”

At the reading of this Bill on the 21st of July, Lord Redesdale
[K 2]

moved that it be read a third time that day three months, contending that too much of condition attached to the retirement of the Bishops, and the Bill was therefore of a financial character.

The Earl of Derby contended that the correspondence showed that there had been a distinct negotiation in order to consult the convenience of the Government. The Lord Chancellor said, there had been no negotiation except what appeared from the correspondence. The Earl of Wicklow said, he had voted in favour of the second reading, and should not now oppose the Bill, but refrain from voting altogether. The transaction might not legally amount to simony; but for a Bishop to offer to place his see in the hands of a Minister on condition of being secured a certain income by law was as much simony as anything could be. The Duke of Somerset remarked, that when the Bill got down to the other House it would be designated by a much stronger name than simony; it would be looked on as a bargain between the Prime Minister and the Bishops. What a position the Government would be placed in, if the House of Commons reduced the £6000 a year to £5000! The Bishop of Oxford renewed his argument against the Bill, contending that the transaction was simony; and, as one of the classes privileged by the Bill, he rejected the offer of exemption from the penalties of the law.

The third reading, however, was carried by 26 to 15, and the Bill passed the Lords.

On the 22nd of July Lord Palmerston moved the second reading in the Commons. In explaining the nature and origin of the Bill,

he stated some things not previously mentioned during the debates on the subject. Early in the session the Marquis of Blandford had called attention to the fact, that there were some Bishops on the Bench whose age and infirmity rendered them unable to discharge their duties, and the Government had been asked to provide for those cases. Their first intention had been to propose a general measure founded on the analogy of the course of proceeding in relation to the Judges. Means were to have been established by which Bishops could of their own accord retire upon allowances with the consent of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. That measure was necessarily deferred; and in the meantime the Bishops of London and Durham had intimated their wish to retire. The Government thought it would be proper to frame a Bill limited to those particular cases, because the emoluments received by the two Bishops were greater than the regulated sums that would be paid to their successors. He then eulogised the high and generous character of the Bishop of London, and denied that the Government had offered the Bishops inducements to retire in order that an opportunity might be created of making fresh appointments, or that anything corrupt or simoniacal had taken place. It was true that other remedies had been suggested. Some persons had proposed, for example, that the duties of the diocese of London should be performed by one of the other Bishops. "I understand it has been said that the person holding the appointment of Bishop of Oxford might undertake the work. I think there are many

obvious reasons why that arrangement would not be a fitting one. ('Hear, hear!') There is no man more able from his talents and ability than the present Bishop of Oxford to perform any extra duty that might be imposed on him; but I think that no one could satisfactorily perform the duties of those two sees, and that the arrangement is one which Parliament would not for a moment be disposed to countenance. ('Hear, hear!') Other persons have proposed that coadjutor Bishops should be appointed; but I think that that arrangement is also exceedingly objectionable. If the coadjutor Bishop had no succession, he would be simply in the position of a subordinate, and he would not exercise the influence which ought to belong to his office. Then it is said that we might appoint Bishops coadjutors with succession when a vacancy occurred; but I think that that would be a very objectionable and inconvenient state of things, because, if the infirm Bishop and the coadjutor were to have co-ordinate authority, you would have possibly a conflict of opinion and a diversity of judgment upon all the matters that belong to the functions of a Bishop. If, on the other hand, to avoid those two inconveniences, you were to transfer the authority from the existing Bishop to the coadjutor, then you come to the very arrangement, substantially, which this Bill is calculated to establish. You would then have the coadjutor performing all the functions of the Bishop and exercising all the authority in the diocese, but still he would not have that influence and consideration which are essential to the due performance of the duties, and

you would have two Bishops in one diocese, which is a highly objectionable arrangement."

Upon the following day, Sir William Heathcote moved that the Bill should be read a second time that day three months. A long debate then followed. The opponents of the measure were arrayed in two sections. The first comprised the mover of the amendment and its seconder, Lord Robert Cecil, and also Mr. Napier, Mr. Gladstone, Sir James Graham and Mr. Henley. Their views were stated at great length. They argued, that the Bill, which was partial and incomplete, which threw difficulties in the way of future and general legislation, proposed to apply a local remedy to an old evil; that the resignation to which it would give effect was conditional; and that the principle of conditional resignation was not recognised by the Church, which required that it should be "*absolutè, spontè, purè, et simpliciter*," whereas the Bill was nothing but a resignation upon a pecuniary condition which was illegal in this country. The transaction sanctioned by the Bill was of a simoniacal character. It was a bargain between the Minister and the Bishops. It was an offer of the nature of a money bargain to sell exalted stations in the Church. It raised for the first time the question, whether the tenure of Spiritual Peers in the House of Lords should be for life or for such period only as Parliament should provide. It was an Act for which there had been no precedent since the Reformation. In the beginning of the reign of George the Third, Dr. Pearce, Bishop of Rochester, wished to resign his see in order that he

might be appointed Bishop of London, the duties of which office he had long performed for Dr. Sherlock. Dr. Pearce resigned his see to George the Third on an intimation from Lord Chancellor Northington that such a step was practicable. When he had resigned, however, Lord Bath, who had promised to obtain his translation to the see of London, procured it for Dr. Newton. This alarmed the Ministry, who thought the ecclesiastical patronage was slipping away from them. Lord Northington, who had been first doubtful as to the practicability of resignation—who then became clear—again suddenly became doubtful of the right to resign, and the King was induced to send for Dr. Pearce and tell him he must think no more about resigning. That showed how dangerous were those attempts to resign, and how soon political influences rose up and multiplied. It was further objected, that the preamble of the Act did not contain a correct recital of the case. It stated that the Bishops had expressed a desire to vacate their sees on account of their inability to discharge the duties of their offices. If that was true it would be a perfectly legitimate proceeding; but the preamble suppressed the fact of the contract, the pecuniary conditions, upon which they proposed to retire. The remedy suggested instead of the Ministerial plan was a general measure similar to that brought in by Sir Robert Peel in 1843, which applied to all cases, and provided for Bishops not suffering alone from mental but also from bodily infirmities, or the appointment of suffragan Bishops under the Act of Henry the Eighth.

Mr. Gladstone, in addition to

his opposition to the Bill, made a severe attack upon the Ministry for their practice of introducing Bills of capital importance when the session was expiring. After observing that, if the practice was continued, the House in self-defence must fix positive dates after which it would not entertain such measures, he said, "We have, in fact, come to a state of things in which some forty or forty-five persons holding office under the Government virtually decide every question before the House. It is hardly possible that any combination of Members, or the union of any body of persons, whatever their position or views may be, can face so formidable an official phalanx. ('Hear, hear.')

In the first few weeks of the session no evil can arise from meeting such an official body; on the contrary, it is necessary that there should be such an attendance in order to conduct the ordinary business of the House. But it is an abuse, and a gross abuse, and one which we must not be prevented from commenting upon, to bring down to this House a body of Members to vote upon a subject of the gravest importance at the very last phase of the session, and when persons are asking whether the prorogation is to be on the Friday, the Saturday, or the Monday, and when any determination of the House means, and can mean, very little more than the determination of some forty or forty-five Members who hold office under the direction of the noble Viscount."

("Hear, hear!")

The second section of opponents of the Bill consisted of Mr. Roebuck and Mr. Thomas Duncombe. The former urged that the Bill would perpetuate a great scandal,

and exhibit Christian Bishops availing themselves of an Act of Parliament to break through the law. Two prelates who had long enjoyed the richest bishoprics in England, who had become incompetent from age and disease said, "If you buy us off we are willing to go." That was a corrupt contract. If instead of Bishops they had been rectors, they would have been told at once to relinquish their offices. These two Bishops, said Mr. Duncombe, had no right to dictate to Parliament the terms on which they would resign. If they had thrown themselves on the generosity of Parliament, they would have been generously dealt with. Both Members agreed that the Bill was a scandal, which ought to be branded by the House.

The measure found supporters in Mr. Monckton Milnes, Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Black, Sir John Shelley, Mr. Walpole, and Sir George Grey. Their argument was, that the Bill was an exceptional measure to meet exceptional circumstances. Its object was to provide sufficient superintendence for the sees of London and Durham, and to economise materially the funds of the Church. [Mr. Cardwell estimated the immediate annual addition to the funds of the Ecclesiastical Commission at 5,500*l.*, and the ultimate additions when the pensions fell in at 16,000*l.*] Simony was of two kinds: the sin committed by Simon Magus—[Nobody, said Mr. Gladstone in his speech, was likely to commit that sin in the nineteenth century]—which was "*malum in se*;" and the Parliamentary offence, which was "*malum prohibitum*"—an offence which, as Parliament created, Parliament

could remove; and therefore a contract ratified by Parliament could not be simony. Mr. Walpole quoted Gibson's Codex and the 26th of Henry VIII., fixing the retiring allowance of a Bishop at one-third of his income, to show that resignation on a retiring allowance was not contrary to law. The Legislature had permitted Colonial Bishops to resign their sees on retiring allowances. As to the case of Dr. Pearce and the changes in Lord Northington's views, might not those changes have been caused by something other than pressure from his Government? "May they not have been caused, as I fear some of the opposition to this Bill has been caused, by jealousy of the persons into whose hands the fresh appointment might fall?" Mr. Walpole thought the Bill would furnish a precedent for a much better measure than that of 1843. "The principle of the measure, which I approve as a precedent for future legislation, is, that it will enable the Bishops to retire in cases of necessity, subject of course to proper restrictions and guards, which must be thrown around their resignations, so as to prevent, on the one hand, a Minister from using his influence to induce resignations, and, on the other hand, to prevent a Bishop from tendering his resignation for any other causes than those arising from positive incapacity. I think it will furnish a precedent for doing this by giving to the new Bishop two-thirds of the income of the see, and a retiring allowance of one-third to the Bishop who resigns. Upon considering the subject generally, you will find that you can hardly make a better provision than this; be-

cause, if the House will not give retiring allowances out of the funds voted by Parliament, you have no other means of providing these allowances (without trenching on the funds devoted to the poorer clergy), except by so distributing the income of the see between the retiring Bishop and the Bishop who will have to discharge the duties."

Sir George Grey answered Mr. Gladstone's complaint as to the time of introducing the Bill. Look at the dates—

"The letter of the Bishop of London is dated the 18th of June, and that of the Bishop of Durham the 21st of June; and the intention of the Government was announced almost immediately after they were in possession of the Bishops' desire to resign. Of course it required some short time to frame the Bill; but within a fortnight or three weeks from the date of those letters the Bill was laid upon the table of the House of Lords." Singularly enough, the Bill of 1843, which Sir James Graham regarded with such parental affection, came down from the House of Lords on the 21st of July—the identical day on which the present Bill came down.

Before going to a division, Lord Palmerston said that the Government would stand by the proposal contained in the Bill as to the retiring pensions of the two Bishops. What the Bishops would do if the House diminished the amount, he could not say. The bargain was, to *propose* a Bill to Parliament; that had been fulfilled; and the House must decide upon the matter.

Mr. Gladstone asked whether the Government would proceed with the Bill if the pensions were

reduced? Lord Palmerston answered — "We shall announce that after the division is taken." (*Cheers.*)

On a division, the amendment was negatived by 151 to 72. The Bill was read a second time, and committed for the 24th; Lord Palmerston agreeing, in answer to the opposition of Mr. Henley and Mr. Gladstone, that amendments might, under the circumstances, be moved without the usual previous notice.

The Bill was stiffly contested through every stage on the 24th. On the motion for going into Committee, Mr. Hadfield, in a speech drawing a contrast between the high incomes of English prelates and the low incomes of the Pope and the Roman Catholic Bishops, moved that the House should go into Committee that day three months. Thereupon the debate was revived and continued on the principle of the Bill by several Members. But the voting power of its supporters was too strong to be encountered; the amendment was withdrawn; and the House went into Committee. Mr. Gladstone moved an amendment on clause 1, which would have had the effect, as Sir George Grey contended, of making the Act a general Act, instead of a particular measure applicable to two cases only. The amendment was not discussed at all; and the chief incident in the Committee at this stage was a passage of arms on a point of law and legal learning between Mr. Gladstone and the Solicitor-general. Since the conflict had arisen, said Mr. Gladstone, they had better fight it out: they stood there on a footing of equality. So they fought it out, to the amusement of the Committee.

Mr. Gladstone did not, however, go to a division, and the clause was agreed to.

On clause 3, fixing the amount of the pensions, Mr. Thomas Duncombe moved an amendment equivalent to striking out the clause. Negatived by 105 to 30. Mr. Roebuck moved to substitute "3,500*l.*" for "6,000*l.*" as the amount of the Bishop of London's pension. Negatived by 104 to 19. Mr. Roebuck then moved that the pension of the Bishop of Durham should be 3,000*l.* instead of 4,500*l.* Negatived by 52 to 19.

In the course of the proceedings in Committee, Sir James Graham asked whether the letter of the 21st June, 1856, was the first communication from the Bishop of London in reference to his retiring allowance; whether the Bishop of Durham did not require a larger sum; and whether his letter of the 21st of June was not the result of frequent communications between him and the Government on the question of the pension?

Lord Palmerston replied that he heard the circumstances referred to for the first time. "It

is perfectly true that, in the course of last autumn, or rather, shortly before the Christmas holidays, I was informed verbally that the Bishop of Durham wished to resign. I took those steps upon that communication which I thought to be necessary, having then an intention of bringing forward a measure relating to these cases. But after a certain period I was informed, from the same quarter, that the Bishop of Durham no longer wished to resign; therefore the matter dropped. The first communication made to me by the Bishop was by letter. It may be, and very possibly was, the fact, that some days before that letter was actually written a verbal communication was made to me on the point; but this I do state, that at no time was any larger sum proposed than what has been mentioned, nor was there any communication such as has been talked of, or any objection made by me to any larger sum than that which is mentioned in the Bill."

Ultimately the Bill passed through the various preliminary stages and became law.

CHAPTER VI.

Finance—The Navy Estimates are Moved by Sir C. Wood—Various topics connected with the subject are discussed by Captain Scobell, Admiral Berkeley, Sir Charles Napier, Sir Francis Baring, and others—At a subsequent period of the Session, Sir C. Wood also moves the Supplemental Estimates, when observations are made and suggestions offered by Admiral Walcott, Mr. Lindsay, Sir George Tyler, Sir Charles Napier, Sir James Graham, and other Members—The Army Estimates are Moved by Mr. Monsell—Explanations by Mr. F. Peel, and Observations of Colonel Dunne and Sir De Lacy Evans—Resolutions on the Income-Tax Moved by Mr. Muntz—Speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in opposition to the Motion, which is negatived—Financial Statement by the Chancellor of the Exchequer relative to the remainder of the current year—Comments of Mr. Gladstone and other Members—The Budget—Speeches of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Disraeli, Lord Palmerston, Sir Francis Baring, and Mr. Gladstone—Remarks by Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Alcock, and others.

ON the 11th of February, the House of Commons having resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, the Navy Estimates were moved by Sir Charles Wood. He prefaced his general statement by an explanation of his improvements in the official arrangements at the Admiralty, and its co-ordinate departments, especially as regarded book-keeping, the payment of wages, and other matters of business.

The first sum to be granted was 204,000*l.* for an excess of expenditure in the last year. For the active force of the navy it was intended to ask a vote of 66,000 seamen and marines—being 6000 more than last year—and 10,000 boys. The estimate for the wages of this force was 3,237,893*l.* showing an increase of 352,356*l.* beyond the amount granted last

year; but of this gross total he should require a present vote of only 2,000,000*l.* Not that he believed that sum would be all that, under the most favourable circumstances, would be required during the year, but he would take it merely on account. Sir Charles Wood then went through the various items of the estimates, giving explanations on every point, and showing a sum total for the estimates amounting to 12,148,641*l.*, being an increase of 291,135*l.* over the previous estimate, besides the additional 204,000*l.* in excess. Respecting the Black Sea Establishment, Sir Charles Wood trusted that important reductions would be carried on before the close of the year. On bringing forward the vote for "half pay," the right hon. baronet took occasion to vindicate the bestowal of good service

pensions upon Captains Keppel and Lord Clarence Paget. Considering the high character of the services of those officers, he trusted the Committee would not consider the pensions either improperly or unfairly bestowed. With respect to the Transport Service, Sir Charles Wood called the attention of the Committee to the great skill and diligence of the commanders of these ships, by which no less than 294,000 men had been this year moved without a single disaster. Sir Charles next proceeded to explain various matters connected with retirements and promotions in the navy, and with the pay and pensions awarded to men and officers. In conclusion, the right hon. baronet called attention to the high state of efficiency of the navy, and of its brilliant services during the past year, describing the bombardment of Sweaborg as a most brilliant affair — everything inflammable was destroyed; and though it was impossible to tell how many of the enemy were killed, yet he believed that not less than 1000 men were blown up at one explosion. “It is said, why was not Cronstadt attacked? On this point I may state that we had not, with regard to small vessels, the support on which we at first calculated. An agreement had been made between the French and English Governments to send an equal number of floating batteries to the Baltic. Afterwards the French Government changed its views as to the best mode of carrying on the war, and they sent their floating batteries to the Black Sea; but, although we had the number intended, yet the whole number originally agreed upon was not sent.” Should another campaign

be necessary, so great had been the energy of the Government and the vigour of the Naval Executive, that no less than 350 British pennants would float in the waters of the Baltic by spring, while 100 covered the Black Sea.

A discussion then ensued between Captain Scobell, Admiral Berkeley, Sir Charles Napier, and Sir Francis Baring, upon the successive votes, the questions of retirement and bounties, and the constitution of the Board of Admiralty, being severely handled by Sir Charles Napier. A vote of 76,000 men was taken for three months; several money votes, on account, were also agreed to. Upon the vote for home naval establishments, Mr. Maguire called the attention of the House to the neglect of Ireland, which had a right to a fair share of patronage. The natural resources and advantages of Cork pointed it out as a harbour peculiarly suited for a naval station.

Sir Charles Wood could not agree with Mr. Maguire. It was not intended to have large dockyards and naval establishments in Ireland until they were wanted. Ships of war, after being fitted out or repaired at the home ports, were duly distributed over the different ports of the United Kingdom.

Mr. Spooner objected to the sums included in the estimates as allowances to Roman Catholic chaplains. He thought them as unreasonable as the Maynooth grant, and at some future time would call the attention of the House to the subject. The vote having been agreed to, the House resumed.

On the 14th of June the supplemental Navy Estimates were moved by Sir Charles Wood. In

the course of his explanatory statement Sir Charles said the House had already voted 76,000 men; it was proposed to diminish the number by 20,000; but practically, since only 70,000 were raised, the real reduction would be 14,000. The force of Royal Marines—16,000—would not be reduced. He thought that, with the experience they had derived from the war, they would not be consulting the true interests of the country if they did not in future maintain, and that permanently, a larger number of men than it had been the practice to maintain in recent years. The reduction in the vote for naval stores was half a million. There was a new vote of 40,000*l.* for the purchase of land necessary for the extension of Deptford Dockyard. The original estimate for the Transport service was 7,000,000*l.*; of which sum 6,000,000*l.* was voted on account: he proposed to rescind that vote, and substitute a vote for 4,977,200*l.*

Mr. Williams, Admiral Walcott, Mr. Lindsay, Sir George Tyler, and Sir Charles Napier all expressed their approbation of the intention announced to keep up a larger naval force. Sir J. Graham also concurred, and offered several suggestions, the chief of which was, that the coast-guard should be transferred from the revenue department to the Admiralty, for the purpose of rendering it really efficient as a great arm of defence attached to the British navy. Sir Francis Baring said he looked upon the coast-guard as one of our most valuable naval resources, and he should be glad to support any legislation necessary to carry out the plan of Sir James Graham.

The votes were then agreed to.

On the 22nd of February, Mr. Monsell, in a Committee of Supply, moved the Army and Ordnance Estimates, and in doing so explained in detail the items contained in the army estimates. The number of men of all classes to be voted was 246,716—an excess of 30,378 men over the vote of last year. Additions had been made to the Infantry, Artillery, Sappers and Miners, Land Transport Corps, and Army Works Corps. The increase in the Land Transport Corps amounted to 9020 men. The number of men for the British Foreign Corps was 21,719—an increase of 6769 over the vote of last year. The vote for the Turkish Contingent was 29,000 men. They had required for the Militia last year the sum of 3,435,728*l.*, and the amount then asked was 3,150,129*l.* The strength of the Militia last year was 38,520*l.*; its then strength was 66,317. For the forty-nine disembodied regiments of English Militia in January 1855, the number of soldiers called out was 22,845. The item for forage for 60,000 horses amounted to 4,861,928*l.*; last year, the expense of forage was only 1,418,300*l.*—the increase this year was therefore 3,443,628*l.* The increase of expenditure for fuel and light at the seat of war amounted to 78,000*l.* The vote for works and buildings was 2,044,069*l.*; but of this sum 1,072,164*l.* was required for works of fortification already set on foot in Kent, Sussex, Devonport, Aldershatt, Dublin, and other places.

The supplemental Ordnance Estimates amounted to 1,346,023*l.* The sum required for the land forces was 10,950,398*l.*; and the

grand total for the effective and non-effective services was 34,998,504*l.*—an excess of 6,328,007*l.* over the votes of last year.

The bulk of the army estimates were thus voted; but, in order to afford the House of Commons an opportunity of discussing the reductions consequent on the peace, it was arranged that a supplementary vote of 10*l.* should be subsequently moved for in Committee of Supply.

This was accordingly done on the 16th of June. After some complaints as to the unsatisfactory mode of presenting the estimates lumped in twenty large items, Colonel Dunne protested against the extravagant payment of the foreign legions compared to the English forces. Nearly 60*l.* a year per man, including everything, was paid to each soldier of the foreign legions, while the utmost pay our men obtained was from 12*l.* to 15*l.* per annum. If such terms as had been granted to foreigners had been offered at home, there would have been no lack of recruits. The state of the accounts was also disgraceful, and it was necessary that a committee of the House should be appointed to examine them.

Sir De Lacy Evans did not wish to say anything to the discredit of the foreign legion, but, although German troops might be extremely well disciplined, it was no reason to prefer them to English soldiers. During the late war the militia had nobly reinforced the army, and the country was indebted to the noblemen and gentlemen of England for their patriotic conduct in training the militia. These gentlemen, however, had been treated with the utmost contempt by the war department. The

militia were disbanded with a gratuity of fourteen days' pay only, while the foreign legions obtained a whole year's! He said distinctly there was a German influence exercised in this country which ought to be set aside. (*Cheers.*) When they were disbanding the militia and the troops of the line in the most ungrateful manner, to send up German recruits, who had never fired a shot in the war, to be established as it would seem permanently at Aldershot, was not a state of things which should be allowed to continue. (*Cheers.*)

Mr. F. Peel then entered into detailed explanations of the reductions contemplated. He said there was a saving of 4,000,000*l.* upon the original estimate. That arose in this way. The number of men originally voted was 246,716 of all arms and ranks; the fifty regiments whose head-quarters were in the Crimea had a total strength of 16 companies, or 2000 rank and file. It was proposed to reduce them to 12 companies, or 1000 rank and file. There were 83 regiments of the line, or 83,000 rank and file; and these, plus 12,000 officers and non-commissioned officers, made a total of 95,000 men. Allowing a margin of 10,000, that would make 105,000—or about 50,000 less than the original vote of 154,000 men for the infantry. The Guards would be reduced to 7000; the Horse and Foot Artillery, from 23,000 to 21,000 or 20,000. The army would be divided into seven divisions or fourteen brigades; each division and brigade having its own staff-officers. In the cavalry there would in future be maintained more men than horses in the proportion of four to three. There would be a saving of a mil-

lion and a half in the infantry branch of the service, half a million in the other arm of the service, and about 300,000*l.* in the Transport Corps. There would be 1,700,000*l.* to account for. The sum voted for the Turkish Contingent was 300,000*l.*; there would be a saving of about 100,000*l.*. There would be a saving upon the field allowances of about 600,000*l.*. the sum voted having been 818,000*l.*; and there would also be a saving in the sum voted for the purchase of horses of about the same sum, namely 600,000*l.* Upon the sum voted for the levy of recruits, namely 350,000*l.*, there would be a saving of about 200,000*l.*; making together the four millions.

All the votes were ultimately agreed to.

On the 8th of April the much discussed question of a more equitable adjustment of the income-tax came before the House of Commons, when Mr. Muntz moved the following resolution:—

“That, in the opinion of this House, an equitable adjustment of the income and property-tax is essential to the interests of the country, particularly as regards the rates of payment upon industrial and professional incomes compared with those derived from fixed property.”

He said the income-tax, as collected, was unjust and unequal in its operation. Not only was the same rate of taxation levied upon industrial and professional incomes as upon real property, but it was unjustly levied. Within the last three months, the drivers on railways had applied to be relieved from the tax, on the ground that, in consequence of one thing and another, they did not make 100*l.*

a year; they were told they would not be taxed on more than 100*l.* but they must pay on that amount. A man who derived a gross income of 100*l.* from three houses was subject to annual deductions and losses amounting to upwards of 28*l.*; yet he was obliged to pay upon 100*l.* In the case of small houses the injustice of the tax was yet more glaring. A man deriving a gross income of 10*l.* 8*s.* from thirteen small houses at three shillings a week was subject to deductions and losses to the extent of upwards of 56*l.*; yet he also paid upon 100*l.* Thus, while landowners and fundholders paid 6½ per cent., owners of middling and small house property pay at the rate of 10 and 15 per cent. Mr. Muntz avowed himself to be in favour of a property-tax, but he could see no reason why the income-tax could not be properly adjusted and honestly collected.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Pollard Urquhart, who would not agree, however, that landowners did not pay their share. The tax, he contended, pressed with severity upon professional incomes and life annuities. The Government should capitalise all incomes, and thus make the tax fair and equitable.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer admitted that the motion was of great importance; but he pointed out that Mr. Muntz, who asked the House to pledge itself to re-construct the income-tax, had not stated with distinctness the grounds on which he called for a reversal of our policy, nor had he indicated the general principles on which that re-construction ought to proceed. All taxes were open to serious objections. The income-tax last year yielded 16,418,000*l.*,

and such an amount could not be levied without producing many complaints; but if a Minister waited until he could find a perfect tax, he would annually have to come forward with an empty budget. The income-tax was introduced by Mr. Pitt, and underwent various alterations between 1797 and 1816. In 1842, Sir Robert Peel, profiting by the experience of Mr. Pitt, introduced the tax in its present form; and now Mr. Muntz demanded that we should depart from a system founded on experience, and substitute for it one of which we know nothing. In 1842 both sides adopted the dictum of Adam Smith, that every subject should pay towards the support of the Government in proportion to his ability. Now Mr. Muntz proposed a property-tax; but Adam Smith did not say subjects should pay in proportion to the property they possessed, but "in proportion to the revenue they enjoy under the protection of the state." The ability of a person to pay ought to be measured by his annual revenue. Taxation would not be considered prospective. If, as Mr. Hume had said, the best tax would be "an equal tax on the realised and industrial property of the United Kingdom"—and if that principle were worked out, the whole of our present system of taxation must be swept away. It was erroneously assumed that there were only two sets of incomes—one permanent, the other precarious—one represented by an estate, the other by a profession. But the fact was that no such distinction existed; there was a scale of incomes from the most permanent to the most precarious, but between them there were infinite degrees, and it was scarcely possible to define where

the sources of a permanent nature ended, and those of a precarious nature began.

He then illustrated his proposition by a variety of familiar instances, and showed that an attempt to construct the income and property tax upon the principle of measuring each man's ability to pay, would involve a special schedule for almost every taxpayer in the kingdom. It would be totally inconsistent with our system of indirect taxation, where, as far as the amount was concerned, the pressuro fell equally on the millionaire with 100,000*l.* a year and the man whose wages were 15*s.* a week. Nor was this all; local taxation yielding 10,000,000*l.* and levied on the principle of the income-tax, would have to be remodelled. "The produce of schedule D during the last year was 5,101,000*l.*; of schedule A, 7,666,000*l.*; of schedule C, 1,852,000*l.* The number of persons who contributed under schedule D was upwards of 282,000. With regard, however, to that schedule, it should be borne in mind, when comparing it with the others, that all taxation under the others was charged on property before the property came into the hands of the taxpayer. It was impossible that any such practice should prevail in the case of schedule D, for, be it remembered, that was a self-assessing schedule. He was far from desiring to cast an imputation on the honour or integrity of the professional and commercial men who were classified under that category, but it was in human nature that when men were required to assess themselves for the purposes of a tax, they should make their calculations on principles more lenient and indul-

gent than they would be likely to adopt if they had been required to perform the same duty for other people. It might safely be assumed, that in cases of uncertainty they would not hesitate to give themselves the benefit of the doubt, and that they would put upon their own liability as cautious a construction as possible. It should also be borne in mind that no inconsiderable quantity of property, which might justly be regarded as commercial, was included under schedule A—such, for instance, as quarries, mines, ironworks, gasworks, waterworks, canals, railways, and fisheries. There was in many respects a great analogy between that class of property and that included in the commercial schedule; yet Mr. Muntz would draw a marked distinction between them, and apply a very different rule of treatment to each. Nor must they, in contrasting these schedules, forget that, since the discussion which took place some four years ago on the subject of the income-tax, a new tax had been proposed, which to a certain degree altered the relative positions of schedules A and D—he alluded to the tax upon successions. That was an impost of very considerable magnitude, paid at certain periods in large sums, and which fell exclusively upon property classified under schedule A. All those compensating circumstances must be taken into account; and, when they had examined and contrasted the claims and conditions of each schedule respectively, they would probably arrive at the conclusion that taxation, under whatever system, was at best but a rough adjustment of rival rights and liabilities. In entertaining a proposal, the effect of which would be

most materially to diminish the burdens in schedule D, and to aggravate those in schedule A, it must not, he repeated, be overlooked that, since the time when that resolution was last under discussion, a new tax had been imposed which disturbed not a little the proportions then existing. He thought, considering that circumstance, and bearing in mind Mr. Gladstone's treatment of the question, they might have been spared this unprofitable discussion; and he trusted the House would not adopt an abstract resolution, which, however plausible in theory, it would be difficult, indeed, if not impossible, to reduce to practice.

The motion was opposed by Mr. Laing and supported by Mr. Spooner. Several other Members then attempted to address the House, which had become impatient for a division. Ultimately the motion was negatived by 194 to 63.

On the 22nd of February, the House of Commons was chiefly engaged in dealing with those large sums of money which the war had rendered it necessary for the country to provide. At an early hour the House went into Committee of Ways and Means, to hear a financial statement from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and assent to resolutions authorising a 5,000,000*l.* loan, and the funding of 3,000,000*l.* of Exchequer Bills. The Chancellor of the Exchequer then stated that his object was, not to make the usual financial statement comparing the past year with the ensuing year, but only to deal with the remainder of the current year ending with the 1st of April next, in order to balance the revenue and expenditure of the country as they would have been balanced if

his estimate had been accurately fulfilled. The income, however, while it had exceeded the estimate under some heads—Stamps, Taxes, and Property-tax—had fallen short 297,000*l.* in Post-office, 850,000*l.* in Customs, 1,061,000 in Excise; the whole deficiency of revenue being now reckoned at 1,600,000*l.* The revenue had been disturbed by speculative fluctuations in the sugar trade, exportation of spirits under drawback to supply the wine deficiency abroad, and similar causes. In another part of his speech he produced a number of statistics to show that any large decline in our trade had occurred under speculative reactions peculiar to America and Australia, in directions not affected by the war, and not affecting the really stable and flourishing condition of the country.

The actual expenditure had exceeded the estimate by 1,960,000*l.*, almost entirely under military heads. He compared the expenditure of the last twenty-two-and-a-half peace months—30,984,955*l.*—with the expenditure of the last twenty-two-and-a-half war months—74,549,329*l.*; the difference, 43,564,374*l.*, forming as nearly as could be calculated the precise sum which the war had cost us. At the present moment they were in a financial position nearly 4,000,000*l.* less favourable than he had estimated. He proposed resolutions for raising a sum of 5,000,000*l.* as the means of making good the supply for the service of the present quarter, with a margin to meet the immediate demands of the ensuing year. During the year they had already borrowed 16,000,000*l.*, 6,000,000*l.* had been raised in Exchequer Bills, 1,000,000*l.* in Exchequer

Vol. XCVIII.

Bonds; the present loan would make the entire sum raised by loan 28,000,000*l.* He stated the terms on which he had already obtained a loan of 5,000,000*l.* in Three per Cent. Consols at 90*l.*, with a funding of 3,000,000*l.* of Exchequer Bills at the same rate.

The Resolutions were agreed to; not without some remarks from Members who keep watch upon finance; but there was little worth notice except Mr. Gladstone's caution against supposing that the amount stated by Sir George Lewis represented either the real cost of the war or the real amount of debt incurred. The money borrowed was one thing, stock created was another. The debt created within twenty-four months was probably 36,000,000*l.*; and many items of charge would fall in, which would show that an addition of 50 per cent. above the 43,000,000*l.* would hardly represent the net cost of the war.

On the 19th of May, the House of Commons reassembled after the Whitsuntide recess, and went into a Committee of Ways and Means, when the Chancellor of the Exchequer introduced his budget. He began by reminding the Committee that in the financial statement he made at the end of February, the estimated deficiency for the service of the last year was 3,560,000*l.*; that to cover this deficiency he had proposed to borrow 5,000,000*l.*; that this sum had been borrowed—3,500,000*l.* being paid in the last and 1,500,000*l.* in the present financial year; that he had also received the assent of Parliament to a proposition for funding 3,000,000*l.* of Exchequer Bills, and that after this operation the Exchequer Bills rose from 7*s.* discount to par. Since

he had made his statement in February, the balance-sheet for 1855-6 had been laid before the House. The expenditure for 1855-6 was 88,428,355*l.*; the revenue derived from taxes was 65,704,491*l.*; excess of expenditure, 22,723,854*l.* To this excess must be added 1,000,000*l.* for the loan to Sardinia, and 213,000*l.* for the redemption of hereditary pensions; which made the excess of expenditure over revenue 23,936,000*l.* To cover this excess, he had raised by loan—in Consols, 19,501,000*l.*; in Exchequer Bonds, 977,750*l.*; in Exchequer Bills, 6,000,000*l.*; total, 26,478,750*l.* To account for the excess in the amount borrowed over the excess in payments—2,542,000*l.*—he stated that the balances in the Exchequer, which were 3,949,000*l.* on the 31st of March, 1855, were 5,500,000*l.* on the 31st March, 1856; showing a difference in favour of the Exchequer of 100,000*l.*, owing to money received on account of funding of Exchequer Bills. The expenditure of the past year had been in a great measure for war purposes; and he desired to show, as fairly as possible, the expense incurred during the two years of war. “The total expenditure in two years of war, 1854-5 and 1855-6, for all public purposes whatever, including 1,000,000*l.* advanced on loan to Sardinia, has amounted to 155,121,307*l.* The expenditure in two years of peace, 1852-3 and 1853-4, for the same purposes, was 102,032,596*l.* Deducting, then, the expenditure of the two years of peace from the expenditure of the two years of war, we find that the excess of expenditure in the two years of war was 53,088,711*l.* I think it is impos-

sible, according to this calculation, that any expense which is fairly due to the war can have been overlooked. The revenue from taxation during the two years of war amounted to 125,200,645*l.*, and in the two years of peace to 108,018,123*l.*; the increase of revenue from taxation in the two years of war having been 17,182,522*l.* To this amount I will add the money raised by additions to the funded and unfunded debt, amounting to 33,604,263*l.*; and therefore the total receipt during the two years of war from increased revenue and from money borrowed has been 50,786,785*l.* To this sum the surplus income above the expenditure during the last two years of peace—5,985,527*l.*—should also be added; thus making the total sum applicable to war-expenditure over and above the sums applied to peace-expenditure 56,772,312*l.* Now, if we compare the estimated expenditure for the present year with the expenditure of the years of peace immediately preceding the war, we shall find that there is an excess of 24,500,000*l.*; and, adding to that amount the excess of expenditure in the two years of war—53,088,000*l.*—we arrive at a total expenditure for the three years of 77,588,000*l.*”

Here he dwelt on the peculiar character of the late contest, to show how, by applying the means of science, we were able to crowd into a small space of time operations that in former times were spread over a far longer term; and how thereby we had avoided those drains upon industry and trade, and, by waiving our maritime right, those incidental disputes, so severely felt in former wars. The slight cloud that had arisen between

this country and the United States, he trusted, would be speedily removed. When we began the war we were unprepared; but during the last two years we had extended and improved our naval and military establishments. And all our expenditure had not been merely to accomplish temporary objects; much of the outlay remained in a permanent form.

He next stated the estimated expenditure for 1856-7. For all practical purposes, the present year must be looked upon as a year of war-expenditure. An expenditure in preparation that had proved unnecessary had been incurred. There was also the expense of bringing home the troops from the Crimea, including the Sardinians. Notwithstanding these sources of expenditure, the Government were happy to be able to present a reduced estimate. "The original estimate for the Army, presented before Easter, was 34,998,000*l.*; the revised estimate, presented a short time ago, was 20,747,000*l.*; making a difference of 14,251,000*l.* The original estimate for the Navy was 19,876,000*l.*; the revised estimate was 16,568,000*l.*; showing a difference of 3,308,000*l.* The total estimates for the Army and Navy, as originally presented, were 54,874,000*l.*; the revised estimates were 37,315,000*l.*; show-

ing a total reduction of 17,559,000*l.*"

Besides these expenses, there was an expense arising out of our convention with Sardinia. By the convention of January, 1855, Great Britain undertook to lend a second million to Sardinia if the war should not have been brought to a close at the expiration of twelve months after the payment of the first instalment. The act carrying the convention into effect received the Royal assent on the 26th of April; the treaty of peace was ratified on the 27th April, 1856—exactly one year and one day after the convention received the Royal assent. Some delay, in no way attributable to the Sardinian Government, took place in 1855, and the first instalment was not paid until the 3rd of May. But the Government felt that, although by a literal construction of the convention they would not be justified in advancing a second million, yet that practically the second year of war had commenced, and that the spirit of the treaty required the payment of the second million. He trusted the House would authorise the Government to carry into effect the spirit of the treaty.

He next stated the estimated expenditure for 1856-7; explaining that the vote of credit for 2,000,000*l.* was taken as a measure of precaution.

<i>Expenditure.</i>	<i>Gross.</i>	<i>Net.</i>
Funded Debt, including New Loan	£27,635,000	£27,635,000
Unfunded Debt	1,025,000	1,025,000
Permanent Charges on Consolidated Fund .	1,750,000	1,750,000
Army	£20,747,000	
Navy	16,568,000	
Civil	6,800,000	
	44,115,000	44,115,000
Charges of Collecting the Revenue	4,588,000	
Vote of Credit	2,000,000	2,000,000
Loan to Sardinia	1,000,000	1,000,000
Total Expenditure	£82,113,000	£77,525,000

The next subject was taxation. Beginning with the Income-tax, which would continue for the present and another year, he estimated the produce in round numbers at 16,000,000*l.* The taxes on tea, coffee, and sugar, he proposed to continue at their present amount during the current year, that was, from the 30th of March last until the 5th of April next. He entered into details to show that, since 1835, there had been such a great increase in the consumption of tea, coffee, and sugar, as had materially benefited the revenue; that in spite of the increase of the duties on spirits during the war, these duties were never in a sounder state; that although there had been a diminution in the consumption, yet it was not wholly due to the increased duty, but was in a great degree attributable to the improved habits of the people, and to a large increase of the export to the Continent—4,268,697 gallons—in consequence of the failure of the wine crop. He showed that the war-duty on malt would fall on the 1st of July, under the present law,

from 4*s.* to 2*s.* 8*d.* per bushel. He admitted that the pressure of the duty had considerably diminished the consumption of malt; but he expressed an opinion that the consumption would not be materially increased were the duty diminished. Taking the malt duty as a beer duty in another form, he thought it right to show that beer was lightly taxed. In 1829 there was a beer duty as well as a malt duty and a hop duty; and the three produced, on an average of three years, 7,192,474*l.* During the last three years the average produce of the malt and hop duties was 6,530,886*l.*; the tax on beer in 1829 yielded 7,192,474*l.*; whereas, including the war-duty on malt, it had during the last three years only been 6,530,886*l.* Again, the duty on beer, 25 per cent. per barrel, was altogether insignificant compared with the duty on spirits, 300 per cent. per gallon. Beer, therefore, was very moderately taxed. Here he read the estimate for the current year in a tabulated form.

	<i>Gross Estimate.</i>	<i>Net Estimate.</i>
Customs	£23,850,000	£22,524,000
Excise	17,170,000	16,348,000
Stamps	7,185,000	7,000,000
Land and Assessed Taxes . .	3,110,000	2,950,000
Property and Income-tax . .	16,355,000	16,000,000
Post Office	2,810,000	1,070,000
Crown Lands	260,000	260,000
Miscellaneous.	1,000,000	1,000,000
Total	£71,740,000	£67,152,000

Deducting the estimated revenue from the estimated expenditure, there would remain a deficiency of 10,373,000*l.* But from that deficiency must be deducted 1,500,000*l.* received in the current year as the produce of the loan of 5,000,000*l.* effected before

Easter, and the 2,000,000*l.* margin; which reduced the deficiency to 6,873,000*l.* In this state of the revenue and expenditure, the Government had resolved not to propose any new taxes, nor to diminish any source of revenue, but to make up the deficiency by

borrowing. In the first instance, a loan of 5,000,000*l.* has been taken at 107*l.* 10*s.* 7*d.*, or equal to Consols at 93. The price offered was 100*l.* for 108*l.* Consols; but Baron Rothschild agreed to accept the terms offered by the Government. The Chancellor of the Exchequer dwelt on this transaction as illustrating the great resources of the country. Baron Rothschild had that morning informed him that deposits of 10 per cent. in bank notes or money had been placed in his hands by persons desirous of obtaining a share of the loan, to the amount of 4,000,000*l.*—equal to a capital of 40,000,000*l.* But this loan would not cover the estimated deficiency, and he proposed to cover the remaining estimated deficit of 1,873,000*l.* by taking power to borrow 2,000,000*l.* in Exchequer Bonds or Exchequer Bills. At present it was inexpedient to increase the amount of the Exchequer Bills in the market. The increase of railway debentures, and the placing of money at call with bankers, abridge the demand for Exchequer Bills. The outstanding amount of Exchequer Bills was 20,124,000*l.*; but of this amount 5,000,000*l.* was in the hands of the National Debt Commissioners, and there were therefore no more than 15,124,000*l.* in the hands of the public.

Here he compared our present position with the state of our debt at the end of the war in 1815. “On the 5th of January, 1816, the capital of the funded debt of England was stated at 816,311,939*l.*; on the 5th of January, 1856, it was 766,778,599*l.*; showing a decrease of 49,533,340*l.* That decrease has taken place notwithstanding the addition made to the debt last year. I come now to the unfunded debt,

where the comparison is even more favourable. On the 5th of January, 1816, the unfunded debt was stated at 43,939,708*l.*; on the 5th of January last it was 26,614,200*l.*; showing a decrease in the capital of the unfunded debt of 17,325,508*l.* The total diminution in both the funded and the unfunded debt since the end of the last war is 66,858,848*l.* Let us now see what change has taken place in the charge of the debt. On the 5th of January, 1816, the charge of the funded debt was 30,458,214*l.*; on the 5th of January, 1856, it was 27,275,768*l.*; showing a diminution of 3,182,436*l.* With regard to the unfunded debt, the charge on the 5th of January, 1816, was 2,325,964*l.*; on the 5th of January, 1856, it was no more than 993,769*l.*; showing a diminution of 1,332,195*l.* The total diminution in the charge of the funded and unfunded debt since the close of the last war is 4,514,631*l.*” In connection with this subject, he stated the accruing liabilities in future years. In 1857, 2,000,000*l.* of Exchequer Bonds would fall due; in 1858, another 2,000,000*l.*, and a sinking-fund for war-loans of 1,500,000*l.* The accruing liabilities would be the same in 1859. In 1860, the Exchequer Bonds due would be 1,000,000*l.*, the sinking fund 1,500,000*l.* From 1861 to 1873, there would be an annual payment of 1,500,000*l.* for the war-sinking fund; and from 1874 to 1877 the payment would be 500,000*l.* per annum. In 1860, however, annuities would cease to the amount of 2,150,000*l.*; and in 1867 there would be a cessation of the dead-weight of naval and military pensions to the extent of 585,740*l.* That statement exhibited the only

manner in which a national debt could be extinguished—not by any mysterious self-acting sinking fund, but by raising a surplus revenue by taxation, and applying it annually to the extinction of the debt. All other contrivances were delusive. There was no instance in which power was given to any public body to borrow that was not accompanied by a condition that an annual sinking fund should be set apart to extinguish the debt. Parliament alone had been remiss in applying that mode of extinguishing the debt of the nation itself. The loan that would be submitted to the Committee had not been taken in terminable annuities, because perpetual annuities were the most advantageous to the borrower and lender. A perpetual annuity was not a permanent debt; the one could be extinguished as well as the other.

In the last section of his speech he said that there seemed to be an impression abroad that at this period of transition we should revise our system of taxation. Before that view was adopted, the great exertions made of late years to revise taxation should be considered. The whole tariff was reviewed by Sir Robert Peel in 1842; a large part of it again came under consideration in 1846; and in 1853 the Customs Duties underwent revision; and thus all prohibitive, protective, and excessive duties were swept away, except the duties on foreign spirits and hops. Sir Charles Wood had dealt with the Stamp Duties, Mr. Gladstone with bills and receipts; the Brick Duty, the Soap Duty, the Window-tax, had been repealed; the Assessed Taxes revised, the Hackney Carriage, Post Horse, and Stage Carriage Duties had been reduced.

The great obstacle to an improved system of taxation was not a want of care on the part of Parliament, but the necessity of raising a large revenue.

He read a series of tables showing the relation of expenditure in this country to that of other countries. In 1855-6 the rate of taxation per head in Great Britain was 3*l.* 5*s.*, and the rate per head exclusive of public debt was 2*l.* 5*s.* 4*d.* In France, the rate of taxation per head, in 1855, was 1*l.* 17*s.* 7*d.*; and the rate per head, exclusive of the debt, was 1*l.* 8*s.* 3*d.* In Prussia, the rate per head was 19*s.* 3*d.*, and the rate exclusive of the debt was 17*s.* 3*d.* He thought that if we left out of consideration the great annual charge for our debt, the comparison showed that the portion of the public expenditure within the control of Parliament was reduced within reasonable limits. He mentioned three taxes, however, which were maintained at higher rates than they otherwise would be in consequence of our great expenditure—the duties on tobacco, wine, and fire-insurances. All these duties were inconveniently high, but he did not see how they could be reduced. He had now laid before the Committee his plan: it did not involve any departure from the existing financial system; it was intended merely to supply the deficiencies of the year; and he trusted that it would receive the support of the House of Commons. He moved a series of resolutions, in the usual form, authorising the loan of 5,000,000*l.* contracted in the morning.

Mr. Alcock was of opinion that the duty on fire insurances ought at all hazards to be reduced at once to one shilling, and Mr. Had-

field promised to move at a future period that the duty should be so reduced. Mr. Ball protested against the malt and spirit duties.

Mr. Milner Gibson and Mr. H. Ingram strongly advocated the reduction of the paper duty.

Mr. Disraeli then rose. He expressed his gratification at receiving an assurance from the highest authority that the resources of the country were unimpaired, and hoped, when the excitement of the war had passed away, that the House would give its attention to a most rigid system of economy, and not allow itself to suppose that it could guard against a repetition of the circumstances which had occurred at the beginning of the war by maintaining a much larger military establishment. He thought the present opportunity an admirable one for impressing upon the country the great difference between an effective and an expensive army. The principle was to possess a perfect military system, and rather a model than a large force. He trusted the House would not permit the militia to fall again into a state of inefficiency, as all reductions should be effected upon a distinct principle, viz., one consistent with the maintenance of power in this country and the position which it ought to occupy in the politics of the world.

With respect to the Sardinian loan, the House was always ready to put a large and liberal construction upon treaties; but he thought that, before the House was asked to exercise towards Sardinia a liberality which Her Majesty's Government were not disposed to exercise towards our own troops, some view of the existing relations between England and Sar-

dinia should be put fairly, frankly, and clearly before the House. "I confess myself that nothing that I recollect ever appeared to me so perplexing and so perilous as the position which this country has assumed and the relations which it is now forming in regard to that very kingdom. If I look to the protocols of the conferences of Paris which have been laid on the table, I find expressions of sympathy with suffering Italy which really exceed the usual caution of diplomatic language. The Sovereign of Sardinia is encouraged apparently in every way by the English Government to fulfil the high mission to which his subjects believe him to be called. He is preparing, and he is encouraged to effect, what he deems to be the liberation of Italy. We have authoritative evidence of the feelings of the Sardinian Government, and of the policy of the Sardinian Ministers, in the very important documents which have been promulgated, and certainly if we were to judge from the protocols of Paris and from the documents of the Sardinian Ministers, we should come to the conclusion that there was a perfect understanding between the English Ministry and the Sardinian Government, and that, in fact, not only was the liberation of Italy an adopted policy, but that the means of effecting it had been agreed upon, and that England was to occupy a great position in the undertaking. But how are we to reconcile such language and such diplomatic documents with the publication of that tripartite treaty, if not secretly at least unexpectedly concluded, which apparently not only fashions but consolidates a policy opposed and adverse to that

which Sardinia has adopted, which she is encouraged to prosecute, and which, according to the documents of her eminent Ministers, she is at this very moment actively prosecuting? The language of the Sardinian Ministers is, that the presence and the rule of Austria in Italy are insufferable—I give no opinion of my own upon these points on the present occasion—that the occupation of Italian provinces by Austria is the principal and the prime source of the degradation, the misgovernment, and the misery of Italy; that these are evils which it is the mission and policy of Sardinia to terminate; and that Sardinia looks, and has reason to look, for the co-operation of England in her efforts to this end. If this be the case, how can we explain that subterranean policy which at the same time signs the protocols of the Congress of Paris, claps the King of Sardinia on the back, and signs a treaty which, we now understand, appeared unexpectedly, and which, if it has any point at all, has this point—that the government of Europe is to be carried on for the future by France, Austria, and England, and that the security for the tranquillity of the world depends upon this tripartite alliance?” He did not say that such an alliance might not be wise policy, but it could not be wise or politic to enter into an alliance which, if it meant anything, meant a guarantee of the consolidation and perpetuity of the Austrian empire, and of course of her Italian dominions, and at the same time to enter into relations with the King of Sardinia which would stimulate him to a policy which had produced the tripartite treaty. An explanation of the strange incon-

sistency between the protocols of Paris and the tripartite treaty was highly desirable. He wished to prevent a repetition of the scenes of 1848:—“I do sincerely hope that, profiting by the bitter experience of 1848, and by the recollection of Lord Minto’s mission, and of those scenes of popular tumult which, excited by English influence, were deserted by English power—a desertion remembered to this day on the Continent with anguish and indignation, notwithstanding the intervening war in which the troops of Sardinia took so gallant a part—I say, Sir, that I do devoutly hope that, bearing all these things in mind, the House of Commons will refuse to be made the cat’s-paw of any Government for the sanctioning of that pseudo-liberalism which, while it affects sympathy with oppressed lands, strengthens the hands of their oppressors.” (*Cheers.*) If the House neglected this lesson, they would bring dishonour on the reputation of England. “I trust, therefore, that we shall be most scrupulous in exacting from the Government a precise, frank, and definite account of the relations between this country and Sardinia, that we may understand whether we have played our cards so badly at the late game of diplomacy that we are at the same time pledged to support Austrian authority and Sardinian regeneration. This is a question which is recurring to many minds in this country. It has touched the heart of England, and be assured it is watched with anxious attention throughout Europe. I feel a deep interest in the future of Italy—(‘Hear, hear!’)—and sure I am that there is no honest man in this empire who does not look forward with delight

to the day when that immemorial land to which we all owe so much shall take her proper place among the nations, and be again one of the leading communities of the world. (*Cheers.*) But I for one base my hope of that consummation on my faith in the genius of the people and the resources of the country. Time, the great reformer, will save Italy; but if there can be anything that will throw her back in her career—anything that will baffle her advancing destinies—it will be the intrigues of politicians who are not Italians, and who, for the sake of getting an impulse and support which otherwise they might not command, trifle with the fate of a great people, pander to the lusts of secret societies, pretend to sympathy they do not feel, and, for the love of popular applause and a momentary success, compromise the destiny of a great and gifted nation." (*Loud cheers.*)

Lord Palmerston briefly addressed the Committee wholly on the Italian point. He said the surmises of Mr. Disraeli were entirely destitute of foundation. There was no mystery in our relations with Sardinia; they were known to everybody, and appeared upon the face of the protocols and the treaty; they were the relations of perfect confidence and friendship and of intimate alliance; but as to any secret project of revolutionizing Italy, there was not the slightest ground from which any man could imply such an imputation. The treaty with Austria was for one purpose, and for one only, namely, that there should be a mutual engagement between England, France, and Austria, to provide for the due execution of the treaty for securing the indepen-

dence of the Turkish empire, but not binding England and France to guarantee the possessions of Austria. He thought that the military occupations of the Italian States were misfortunes which should cease as soon as possible; but there was no engagement for that purpose, except what was patent to all the world on the face of the protocols.

Sir Francis Baring recalled the attention of the Committee to the Budget, and said he thought Sir G. Lewis had taken the wisest course in the then condition of things, but hoped that next year there would be a reduction of the estimates, for which the country would loudly call. Mr. Gladstone began by a reference to Sardinia. He thought Mr. Disraeli justified in his reference to that country. He attached a great importance to maintaining a conviction abroad that we were unanimous in our feeling of respect for the Sardinian Government, and of our sense of the duty of lending it all the moral support we could. If Sardinia should, as Mr. Disraeli seemed to think, entertain schemes of aggression, we could scarcely wonder at it. She laboured under great difficulties; but if she carried into her foreign the spirit of her domestic policy she would renounce her schemes of aggression. She must practise self-denial and exhibit a right example to Italy, and in the moral force flowing from that she would find her reward. Passing from this subject to the Budget, Mr. Gladstone combated the impression that the parsimony of the House of Commons had been the cause of our disasters in the late war. As instances that an efficient army need not be an expensive army, he pointed to

Prussia and Sardinia. He also criticised the narrow provision made to meet the expenditure—a surplus of 160,000*l.* upon a sum of 77,000,000*l.* was sailing very near the wind indeed. Sir G. Lewis must hold decided language, and prevent incursions on the revenue; and however Members might differ they should not set

the pestilent example of abolishing taxes, and borrowing money in their stead. The House had become favourable to increased expenditure, and he was sorry they had not taken Sir G. Lewis to task on the amended Navy Estimates and the Vote for Works.

After some further discussion the resolutions were agreed to.

CHAPTER VII.

NATIONAL EDUCATION—Lord John Russell proposes his Resolutions—His speech—Remarks by several Members—Subsequently, in a Committee of the whole House, the Resolutions are debated—Speeches of Mr. Henley, Mr. Adderley, Mr. Warren, Sir James Graham, and Sir J. Pakington—Mr. Ellice, Mr. Liddell, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Milnes, and Mr. Ewart, also address the House—The debate is adjourned, and continued by Lord John Russell, Sir G. Grey, Mr. E. Hall, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Drummond, Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Disraeli—On a division, the Resolutions are rejected by a large majority—The Educational Estimates are introduced by Sir G. Grey—They are agreed to, after observations by Sir J. Pakington, Mr. Barnes, Mr. M. Gibson, Sir S. Northcote, Mr. Henley, Mr. Miles, Mr. W. J. Fox, and others—Cambridge University Reform Bill introduced—Debate on the Motion for going into Committee—Speeches of Mr. Bouverie and Mr. Walpole—The Measure undergoes considerable discussion in Committee, and various Amendments are moved by Mr. Heywood and other Members—In the House of Lords, Lords Lyndhurst and Lyttelton each move an Amendment, which is carried—The Commons agree to the Amendments, and the Bill passes—Education in Ireland—Mr. Walpole's Resolution upon—His speech—He is supported by Sir W. Heathcote, Mr. G. A. Hamilton, Mr. Napier, and opposed by Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Horsman, Mr. Deasy, and Mr. Hughes—The Resolution is carried against the Ministry upon a division—Subsequently, Mr. Fortescue moves a counter-Resolution, which, after considerable discussion, is carried—Her Majesty's Answer to the Address upon Mr. Walpole's Resolution—The withdrawal of the Maynooth Grant is again brought forward by Mr. Spooner—After several divisions, in which the Ministry are defeated, he introduces a Bill on the subject—Remarks of Sir J. Pakington on the Second Reading, which is also carried against the Ministry—Owing to the late period of the Session, the Bill is abandoned—Minister of Education—Bill passed for the appointment of

ON the 6th of March, in accordance with notice previously given, Lord John Russell brought the following series of Resolutions on National Education before the House of Commons :—

“ 1. That, in the opinion of this

House, it is expedient to extend, revise, and consolidate the minutes of the Committee of Privy Council on Education.

“ 2. That it is expedient to add to the present Inspectors of Church Schools eighty Sub-inspectors, and

to divide England and Wales into eighty divisions, for the purposes of education.

“3. That it is expedient to appoint Sub-inspectors of British, Wesleyan, and other Protestant Schools not connected with the Church, and also of Roman Catholic Schools, according to the present proportions of Inspectors of such schools to the Inspectors of Church schools.

“4. That, on the report of the Inspectors and Sub-inspectors, the Committee of Privy Council should have power to form in each division school districts, consisting of single or united parishes, or parts of parishes.

“5. That the Sub-inspectors of Schools of each division should be instructed to report on the available means for the education of the poor in each school district.

“6. That for the purpose of extending such means, it is expedient that the powers at present possessed by the Commissioners of Charitable Trusts be enlarged, and that the funds now useless or injurious to the public be applied to the education of the middle and poorer classes of the community.

“7. That it is expedient that in any school district where the means of education arising from endowment, subscription, grants, and school-pence shall be found deficient, and shall be declared to be so by the Committee of Privy Council on Education, the ratepayers should have the power of taxing themselves for the erection and maintenance of a school or schools.

“8. That after the 1st of January, 1858, when any school district shall have been declared to be deficient in adequate means for the education of the poor, the

Quarter-Sessions of the Peace for the county, city, or borough, should have power to impose a school-rate.

“9. That where a school-rate is imposed, a School Committee, elected by the ratepayers, should appoint the schoolmasters and mistresses, and make regulations for the management of the schools.

“10. That in every school supported in whole or in part by rates, a portion of the Holy Scriptures should be read daily in the school, and such other provision should be made for religious instruction as the School Committee may think fit; but that no child should be compelled to receive any religious instruction or attend any religious worship to which his or her parents or guardians shall on conscientious grounds object.

“11. That employers of children and young persons between nine and fifteen years of age, should be required to furnish certificates half-yearly of the attendance of such children and young persons at school, and to pay for such instruction.

“12. That it is expedient that every encouragement should be given by prizes, by diminution of school-fees, by libraries, by evening schools, and other methods, to the instruction of young persons between twelve and fifteen years of age.”

In formally moving the first resolution, he made a speech of considerable length, comprehensiveness, and great gravity. After remarking on the difficulties of the question, and the fate which had befallen his predecessors who had embarked on a sea noted for its dangerous shoals and rocks, and covered with wrecks, he said he thought the present time propitious

for a further effort to put this country upon a more equal footing in this respect with the most enlightened countries, which had succeeded in establishing a system of national education. In considering the present state of education in this country, he acknowledged that the researches of Sir J. Pakington had been most accurate, and that his statements were most deserving of attention. From the census of 1851, it appeared that there were about 4,000,000 children and young persons between the ages of five and fifteen, and, according to the returns of Mr. Horace Mann, about 2,000,000 were entered in the school books, 1,750,000 of whom were in attendance; but, considering the character of the teachers in some of these schools, it was doubtful whether what appeared upon the surface to be education could be so considered. Of the education in the schools under the Committee of Council on Education, which were attended by upwards of 500,000 children, he would say that the grants from 1839 had been the cause of a great improvement of education, by the training schools for teachers and the general bettering of elementary education; so that, in respect to the number and character of the teachers and the education of the 500,000 children brought up in these schools, the sums laid out by the votes of the House had been well expended. But it was impossible not to admit that, while such had been the advantages attending this instruction, there had been great defects, and it became the House to consider what was the fittest remedy. It appeared to him that Parliament should lay down two principles, from neither of which it should

depart—first, to make the education of the country complete; and, secondly, to maintain, encourage, and as far as possible improve, that which was good in the existing system. With regard to the first, we should, he thought, bring the education of the people of this country at least to the standard in other countries—Switzerland and the United States, for example. Sir J. Pakington had proposed a plan of rating that should be permissive, and that the education should be free; but he (Lord John) thought it clear that we could hardly maintain the present system of grants from the Committee of Privy Council and free schools at the same time. In proposing, as he did, to build upon the foundation of the present system, the question was, how far that system could be improved, bearing in mind that it was intended to appoint a Minister of Education. He proposed to extend, revise, and consolidate the Minutes of Council on Education; to provide for an inquiry into the state of education in every part of England and Wales by the addition of eighty sub-inspectors; that, on the report of the inspectors and sub-inspectors, the Committee of Privy Council should have power to form school districts, consisting of parishes or parts of parishes; and that the sub-inspectors of schools should be instructed to report on the state and means of education of the poor in each district. In providing for additional means, he thought that one kind of aid now received might be very considerably increased—namely, that obtainable from endowed parishes, which wanted power so to apply the funds; and he proposed that the powers of the

Charitable Trusts Commissioners should be enlarged so as to apply these funds to the education of the middle and poorer classes. But he was bound to say he believed that the existing means would be found inadequate, and that it would not be sufficient to give permissive power. He had, therefore, come to the conclusion not only that the levy of a rate should be allowed, but that there should exist somewhere means of compelling a rate; and he proposed that where a parish or district was declared by the Committee of Privy Council to be inadequately supplied with means of education a compulsory rate should be imposed upon that parish or district. Having arrived at this point, that a school-rate should be imposed, he came, he observed, to one of the most difficult parts of the question,—that which related to religious instruction. The rates to be levied would not be applied exclusively to church schools, or to those of any religious denomination in particular; but then the question arose whether any conditions should be imposed, and, if any, what conditions? There was really only one point to consider — namely, whether the schools were to be confined to secular instruction, or whether any moral instruction was to be introduced; and he was of opinion that morals could not be taught separate from the Christian religion. But there were very great practical difficulties in carrying out this proposition. The only conclusion he could arrive at was, that the authority of the Holy Scriptures being generally acknowledged in the country, in all the schools established by the State the Holy Scriptures should be daily read; but, at the same time, where any

parent or guardian of a child objected on conscientious grounds to the child's receiving such instruction the child should be at liberty to withdraw. Then came another difficulty, as to the attendance of children after ten years of age, and he thought the House would agree with him that it was very desirable to obtain the attendance at school of children between the ages of nine and fifteen, and he proposed that the employers of such children should be required to furnish a certificate of their attendance, and should pay for their instruction. There remained a large class still more difficult to deal with,—namely, children between nine and fifteen, who were neither at school nor at work, but were, in fact, idle. He did not think it possible to compel their parents to send such children to school; but he proposed to offer every encouragement, by prizes, diminution of school fees, libraries, and other inducements, to attract such children to school. This, he said, was the plan he proposed; if a better could be suggested, let it be produced; but he trusted the Legislature would not suffer financial or any other difficulties to stand in the way of the adoption of some system of national education.

Lord John Russell's speech was listened to with great attention and interest. No regular discussion ensued, as, in reply to Mr. Henley, Lord John stated that he should not at that stage call for a decision. An interesting conversation, however, arose. Mr. Henley, with much concurrence and some criticism, thought Lord John had attempted too much. Lord Robert Grosvenor, Mr. E. Denison, Mr. Biggs, and Mr. Alcock, expressed a

general concurrence. Mr. Adderley put forward some very decided views, and showed a strong leaning towards local rating for the support of education. Sir J. Pakington entirely agreed with the principle, that we ought to go as far as we could with the present system, and urged the House to lay aside all party politics in considering measures of the kind. Mr. Roebuck and Mr. M. Gibson spoke in favour of secular education. Mr. Hadfield and Mr. Miall protested against all State interference. Lord Palmerston, in a brief speech, highly complimented Lord John Russell, and laid great stress on the necessity of making such changes in the character of the education imparted as would conduce to the teaching of useful things. After a short reply from Lord John Russell, the formal motion on the first resolution was withdrawn, and it was resolved "that, on Thursday, the 10th of April, the House will resolve itself into a Committee of the whole House, to consider the present state of public education in England and Wales." On that day, accordingly, the Resolutions again came under the consideration of the House, which having resolved itself into a Committee, on the motion of Lord John Russell, he moved the first resolution, without any other preface than a reference to the speech in which he had introduced his Resolutions.

Mr. Henley then led off the opposition. He said it was impossible to deal with these Resolutions in detail; he should, therefore, consider the scheme as a whole, under six heads:—First, inspection; and he objected to the general power to be given to the Committee of Privy Council to

appoint 80 inspectors, neither more nor less, with sub-inspectors. Secondly, the formation of districts; here he objected to the authority conferred upon that Committee, without communication with local parties, at discretion, to form school districts, the inevitable result of which in small parishes would be to break up the parochial system. Third, charitable trusts; it being proposed to empower the Charity Commissioners (Lord J. Russell being one) to apply such trust funds, now deemed useless or injurious, to the education of the middle and lower classes, and he showed, by reference to examples, how, in his opinion, the diversion of funds, supposed to be injurious, would work injuriously to the very classes in question. Fourth and fifth, the school-rate and religious teaching; and, under these heads, he objected to the proposed mode of settling the religious question, the House being asked to pledge itself to a vague scheme, which would settle down into a purely secular system. He objected likewise to the rate system itself, the machinery for obtaining the compulsory rate being most inconvenient, especially the employment of the quarter sessions, whereby all the evils of the church-rate dispute would be perpetuated. Sixth, the proposition, made for the first time, to compel the employers of children and young persons between 9 and 15 to pay for their instruction at school. Under this head Mr. Henley discussed at much length the state of education in the national schools, and he complained that Lord John Russell had not indicated what he meant to teach children of upwards of 12 years of age at these schools, citing sug-

gestions from some of the inspectors which evinced a desire to elevate the standard of education too high. He urged that this part of the scheme would incite employers to have recourse to adult, instead of juvenile, labour; that it would tend to keep young children from school, and incur the risk of augmenting the number of those who were neither at school nor at work—a class with which neither Sir J. Pakington's plan nor that of Lord John Russell attempted to deal, but which, he believed, might be dealt with piecemeal, though not upon a large scale. In conclusion, thinking, he said, that the scheme of Lord J. Russell had a strong tendency to secularize education, he moved—equivalent to moving the previous question—that the Chairman leave the chair.

Mr. Adderley, although in favour of an educational rate as the best and most effectual means of supporting education, said that his experience had taught him it was impossible at that time. He therefore recommended the House to confine its attention to an extension of the existing system, so as to include all pauper schools, ragged schools, and schools for the reformation of juvenile offenders. The course taken by Mr. Henley in moving the previous question would, however, lead the public to consider that the House was unwilling even to consider the expediency of extending the existing system—a course dangerous in the highest degree.

Mr. Ellice strongly objected to the Resolutions having reference to charities, and said that Lord John Russell had taken a step in the wrong direction. The best mode of encouraging education was to

give assistance to voluntary efforts. Mr. Liddell and Lord Robert Cecil took a similar view, insisting that the principle of a rate involved a reckless tampering with the principles of religious conviction, and would render the people incapable of a settled belief. Mr. Warren, in an able and earnest first speech, after noticing the many difficulties that beset the question, observed that the speeches of previous speakers had the fault of prematurely superinducing details. The country was becoming disconcerted and disgusted with the vacillation of the Legislature. The State was bound to interfere where no education existed. He could not believe that the difficulties were insurmountable. He could not persuade himself that there was something so exceptional in the character of the country, that its idiosyncrasy was such, that what had been done elsewhere—that that which was most practicable in a free state and in a despotic state, in a young state and in an old state, in a great state and in a small state, in a monarchical state and in a republican state—could not be accomplished in this country. The voluntary system had done admirably well; there was no wish to supersede its friends, but rather a wish to strengthen their hands and give them the benefit of co-operation. That word “co-operation” contained the gist of Lord John Russell's resolutions. The nation had been told that it could not stir a step in reclaiming the great moral waste, because if it did it would be ruining and beating down the safeguards of civil and religious liberty. He asked the House to look at this grand argument, the substratum of so much unreal opposition—of so

much unsubstantial though showy opposition—to these Resolutions. Let the House consider into what a strange paradox it had resolved itself. Our strength was the source of our weakness. We were so powerful that we were powerless. But was it to go forth to the nations of the world that England, so great, could not educate her own children, and that where power was the greatest the least could be done? If this were so, it ought not to be so. Let them not in the nineteenth century—in these critical and remarkable times—stultify themselves by converting that noble thing liberty into licence, by submitting to an ignominious tyranny that arrogated to itself the name of freedom. No language more bitter, no rebuke more severe and grave, could be addressed to the Legislature, than the very reasons which had been assigned for its abdicating its authority in the matter, since that authority was to be seen in constant action, limiting and directing the exercise of the rights of the subject in whatever course it pleased.

Mr. M. Milnes and Mr. Ewart argued in favour of the Resolutions.

Sir James Graham then spoke strongly in opposition to the Resolutions. The most remarkable features in his oration were its strong leaning towards the voluntary system, and the great use he made of two pamphlets which had been recently published by the leaders in the voluntary cause. After expressing his satisfaction that this could not possibly be regarded as a party question, he observed, in reply to Mr. Warren and Mr. Milnes, that it was not moral suasion which these Resolu-

tions contemplated, but direct legal compulsion, and that, so far from being tentative, the step was a most headlong one. In the first place, he objected to the form of the proceeding, which was exactly the reverse of a Bill. It began with details and ended with the principle, some of the details involving the principle; whereas in a Bill the principle was first affirmed and the details were adapted to it. Then, some of the Resolutions were superfluous, not requiring legislation. He passed in review the Resolutions, previous to considering them as a whole commenting upon each. The fourth Resolution abolished the parochial boundary, and did not recognise a union boundary, and he asked for some safeguard or limitation in the new boundary. The seventh Resolution, empowering the majority of the ratepayers to tax the minority, would give rise to all the evils of the church-rate; and the eighth conferred that power upon a body, the Quarter Sessions, than which none could be less suited for the purpose. With regard to the tenth Resolution, which provided for religious instruction, he agreed that if a compulsory rate were adopted there could be no other than secular instruction in the schools. Having travelled through the Resolutions, he referred to the arguments and facts contained in two pamphlets, which, he said, had led him to his present conclusion, and which he believed to be incontrovertible. He objected to the present scheme that it was unnecessary, there being no country in Europe, he asserted, in which the progress of education had been more rapid and satisfactory than in England; and he appealed to statistics in support

of this proposition. His next objection was, that it would be a most expensive and prodigal scheme; that the effect of it would be that all voluntary contributions would cease; everything must be done and paid for by the Government, except what the rates yielded; the cost he calculated at a sum equal to the poor-rate and the county-rate together. He next objected that it would diminish employment; and his fourth objection was, that it would be oppressive to the poor and prejudicial to industry; it was unsound in principle, based upon Government monopoly, and destructive of the free competition of labour. It was, moreover, he contended, constitutionally dangerous in its operation, the enormous patronage furnishing a ramification of influence. "It is proposed," observed the right hon. baronet, "that we should at once hand over to an inspector, aided by a sub-inspector, the appointment of some 34,000 or 35,000 schoolmasters, and all the influence which such a patronage cannot fail to give. The patronage is enormous; but there is also another objection; there is a French word *surveillance*, which I can hardly translate into English, but which implies an inspection of, a watching of, a prying into private affairs by Government servants—('Hear, hear!')—and something very like that system will be created if the present Resolutions are carried out, for it would be necessary to go into every farmhouse and make inquiries with respect to every boy under the age of fifteen. This is the admirable machinery proposed by the noble Lord. ('Hear, hear!') My right hon. friend the Secretary to the Treasury slumbers quietly below me (*loud laughter*, which

disturbed the slumbers of the right hon. Gentleman); but, if such a thing as a general election should take place, this machinery of the noble Lord, this appointment of inspectors, of sub-inspectors, and of schoolmasters, all holding their places under the direct control of a governmental department, will give him more to do than flesh and blood can stand. (*Loud laughter.*) If we allow the use, or it may be the abuse, of such machinery, he will not slumber then. (*Renewed laughter.*) That which is now proposed for the best of purposes may be prostituted to the worst, and we may, if we agree to these Resolutions, in the endeavour to attain an end perfectly legitimate and proper, narrow or suspend the boasted liberty of the people of this country." ("Hear, hear!") He objected further that the scheme was neither hot nor cold, neither religious nor secular. Religion, he urged, was the main-spring of voluntary associations; and if the religious principle were tampered with, the effect would be more dangerous than from the establishment of secular schools at once.

Sir J. Pakington said, he joined issue with Sir J. Graham in the appeal to proofs, and proceeded to reply to his objections to the Resolutions. To maintain the parochial boundaries was simply impossible. He met the objection of Sir James Graham that the scheme was unnecessary, by asserting that the right hon. Baronet was positively wrong in his statistics; and to his opinion that the scheme would be oppressive to the poor, he opposed his own opinion, that it would be directly the reverse. The epithet "unconstitutional," applied by Sir James to the

scheme, was, he said, a common term of reproach employed to express a vague dislike. The suggestion that a school-rate would encounter the same opposition as a church-rate was a mere opinion, and incapable of proof; the two rates were essentially distinct. Sir James Graham had asserted that the voluntary system was sufficient; that England was educated; he (Sir John) affirmed the contrary. "On that subject the right hon. Gentleman quoted statistics, showing that in 1851 the rate of education was higher than in any former period; but the right hon. Gentleman did not state that the progress from 1833 to 1851 was less in proportion to the population than from 1818 to 1833; neither did he advert to the centesimal proportion of the attendance at the schools, which would have shown that the attendance was not so great now as formerly. The right hon. Gentleman then made a comparative statement between the state of education in this country and the Continent. I beg to tell him that on that subject he was positively wrong in all he stated. His statement was thoroughly erroneous. I understood him to say that, as compared with foreign countries, England was only exceeded in the centesimal proportion of attendance by one. This is contrary to my knowledge, and the right hon. Gentleman is altogether misinformed. In Sweden the centesimal proportion of attendance at schools is 1 in 4; in Russia 1 in 7; in France 1 in 6. In Saxony the proportion is 1 in 5; in Denmark 1 in 7. What it is in Holland I don't know. There is only one country which exceeds England in this respect. The right

hon. Gentleman must allow me to refer to the United States of America, and to the state of Massachusetts. On this question I think the superiority of the United States in several of the States, especially in New England, is undeniable, the proportion being generally 1 in 5 and 1 in 6. Instead, therefore, of England having only one country better than itself in this important respect, there are not above three or four countries in Europe which are in a worse position than that in which England stands at this moment."

Sir John Pakington then, denying that he desired to displace the voluntary system or underrate its exertions, adduced a mass of documentary evidence and statistical returns, showing that from 36 to 98 per cent. of prisoners in gaol could neither read nor write perfectly; that the means of education were meagre and inefficient, thus proving that the voluntary system was insufficient, that it did not educate the people, and that some auxiliary system must be adopted. He asked how it was possible, in the face of these facts, gravely to assert that the education of the people of this country was in a satisfactory state. Instead of being progressive, there were parts of England in which education was retrograding. He denied that the Resolutions were open to the charge of being opposed to the spirit of liberty; they proposed a system of local taxation under local management and control. The rate he advocated, because no other practical mode had been suggested whereby the deficiency of funds could be supplied. If any other satisfactory expedient could be devised, he would cease to advocate a rate.

The debate was then adjourned to the following day, when it was resumed by Lord John Russell in a speech of explanation and defence of his whole scheme. He began by commenting on the inconsistency of Sir James Graham, who, after having served on the Educational Committee of the Privy Council, came forward as "the trumpet of the voluntary system." He then defended himself from the attacks of Mr. Edward Baines, who had charged him in one page with bringing a new-fraught scheme of despotism from Vienna in 1855, which scheme, according to another page of the pamphlet, he had concocted in 1839. The voluntary principle, he said, had never been adopted by any nation; and, although he admitted it had done great things in this country, yet it was not possible to maintain the purely voluntary principle with that of establishments. Then the voluntary principle came to this—it seemed to maintain that, while you may support the criminal law, the gaol, and the gibbet, you may not teach any religious truth. But if a criminal could tell a judge who reproached him for violating the laws of God and man that he had never been taught there was a God, or what the laws were, the State was chargeable, if it connived at such a state of things, with a neglect of a most serious and solemn duty. Passing rapidly in review the series of Resolutions, in order to show the general aspect of his plan, which he denied to be altogether compulsory, or to deserve the character of a Government monopoly, Lord John proceeded to discuss the various details, noticing and replying to objections. The proposal to em-

power the Charity Commissioners to apply charitable funds to the purposes of education had not, as he showed, originated with him; but he defended a departure from the strict letter of the foundation, provided the real object of the founder was substantially carried out. The employment of the Quarter Sessions as an organ of imposing a rate had, he observed, been much canvassed and condemned; but he did not know where the authority, to be exercised in extreme cases, could be better placed in conformity with the existing law. The most important question arose upon the tenth Resolution, which provided for religious instruction, and it had been said, he remarked, that schools supported by a rate would become secular schools. But he had evidence which convinced him that, although the difficulty was serious enough in that House, among various denominations, and among theorists, yet in practice there was very little difficulty in the matter. When he was told, he observed, that there was a danger, if these schools were adopted, that they might become secular, he compared this objection with the fact disclosed in prison returns, that there were hundreds and thousands to whom the most common elements of even natural religion were unknown; and when he was told that the Bible must not be taught in these schools, because there was a danger that, some day or other, the schools might adopt a secular character, he answered that although opposed to secular education, he had rather face that danger than leave things as they were. With regard to the provision that the employers of children and young persons should

pay for their instruction, he could not understand, he said, how it could be termed oppressive and despotic, when this very law had been in operation since 1835 or 1836 with respect to 35,000 children. As to the patronage, the appointment of schoolmasters would rest, not with the Treasury, but with the school committees. In conclusion, he stated that he did not propose to ask the Committee to go beyond the first five Resolutions, which sanctioned the principle that the Minutes of Council should be extended, revised, and consolidated, the appointment of inspectors (thereby ascertaining the real state of education in the country), and the formation of districts.

The intimation by Lord John Russell that all the characteristic elements in his scheme were surrendered, caused considerable sensation, and seemed to take the House by surprise.

Sir G. Grey enunciated the principle that the educational system of England ought neither to be constructed upon the model of merely secular teaching adopted in America, nor the compulsory instruction including the inculcation of the State religion practised by the despotic Governments of Europe. He then proceeded to notice the several Resolutions presented by Lord John Russell, observing that his task was rendered much lighter by the surrender of the principal provision they contained. Expressing his perfect accordance with the first Resolution, setting forth the expediency of revising and extending the Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education, the Home Secretary declared that the subsequent Resolutions were practically

inadmissible. On abstract principles, much might be said for them. But the Resolutions in themselves were inoperative, and if it were attempted to embody them in some definite statutes, very serious difficulties would be encountered, leading, in his belief, to most intractable animosities. This distinction between a theoretical approval and a legislative condemnation Sir George went on to apply to the successive propositions comprised in the series, especially as regarded the proposed machinery for inspection, the interference with charitable trusts, and the compromise suggested between the secular and the religious systems of instruction. To the compulsory rate for educational purposes he also objected, but stated that the Government were preparing a Bill to sanction the levy of a voluntary rate in every district where a certain majority of ratepayers might pass a vote with that object.

Mr. Henley, under the changed aspect of the debate, proposed to withdraw his amendment on the first Resolution, and to renew it on the second. Mr. Gladstone, however objected to this abrupt termination to the debate, and it was then continued by Mr. E. Ball, who defended the existing voluntary system, and wished to leave it to its natural development.

Sir Stafford Northcote, notwithstanding the abandonment of the scheme by its author, proceeded to comment upon many of the features it had presented, declaring that, in his opinion, it was not only utterly inadequate, but would make the case worse.

Mr. Drummond observed that every speaker had confounded education and instruction, whereas

they were as distinct as any two things could be. You may buy instruction; but you can't educate people by Acts of Parliament. Scoundrels on a great scale.—John Sadleir, for instance—did not want for instruction. Education is that which is imbibed from the moral atmosphere which a child breathes. You may attempt the reformation of offenders; but the man who wants education wants that which you never can supply. Give him instruction, if you will; and thereby you will only make him ten times worse than before. When your people become offenders against the community, you have really only two ways of dealing with them; namely, to send those who have offended the least out of the country, and those who have offended the most out of the world. (*Laughter and cheers.*)

Mr. Gladstone took objection to the form of proceeding—he would have preferred an Address to the Crown. He then described the solemn manner in which Lord John Russell had invited the House to come to a decision on the subject of education, and said that, after such preparation, he could little have expected that Lord John himself would prevent the House from passing judgment on the most weighty and momentous of the Resolutions. But the explanation was, that he anticipated defeat, and, convinced that a great majority of the House entertained the main objections to his scheme as deep convictions, like a skilful general Lord John was anxious to extricate the remnants of his army from a dangerous and desperate position. The House did not question his intentions; no doubt, he intended to save the principle of local influences as opposed to

central control, and to save the principle of religious as opposed to secular instruction: but the House were convinced that in these vital respects he would be entirely disappointed.

“We have happily found it practicable in England to associate together in the most perfect harmony these two principles—the principle of voluntary exertion, through which you get heart and love and moral influence infused into your school instruction, and the principle of material aid from the State, by which the skeleton and framework of your education are provided.” But if he were driven to abandon the voluntary principle, or place exclusive reliance upon it, he should not hesitate to say at once—“Give me the real education, the affection of the heart, the moral influences operative upon character, the human love, that are obtained through the medium of the voluntary principle carried out by men whose main motive is one of Christian philanthropy, rather than throw me upon a system which, whatever the intentions of its first mover may be, must sooner or later degenerate into hard irreligion.”

Having discussed the Resolutions, and condemned them as tending to create a central controlling power, involving secular instruction and endless religious quarrels, Mr. Gladstone went on to a wider objection. “When we speak of a thing being unconstitutional, we mean that it is out of harmony with our laws and institutions. But there is something more important than our laws and more weighty than our institutions, and that is the national spirit and character out of which they have

sprung, and which are at once their basis and there buttress. I think these Resolutions conceived in a spirit adverse to that national character. They have a tendency in utter contrariety to it. They tend to encourage a dependence which is alien and foreign to the minds of Englishmen—to substitute that which is mechanical, technical, and formal, for that which is free, open, elastic, and expansive. They might enable you to draw up better tables, to compile better statistics, to enter into competition with other nations in matters of figures upon better terms than at present; but it has not been by the technical instruction of her children, by superiority in mere arts of the schools, that England has risen to her present place in the world. She has often been behind the performances of other nations in these respects. She has understood the practical responsibilities of life—the duties of the man, of the citizen, and above all of the Christian. The element of the freedom in which we move and breathe and have our being is essential to the development of the English character; and if you take it away, you pine and starve that character, and any substitute you can give in the form of education returns is utterly worse than worthless.” (*Cheers.*)

Mr. Disraeli hoped that hon. Members would be saved the perplexing task of dividing upon an issue which was now presented in so entangled a shape. He recapitulated the turns and changes which the question had undergone during the two nights’ debate. He commented in sarcastic terms upon the rapid manœuvre executed by Lord John Russell in withdrawing

half his Resolutions from impending discomfiture, and recommended him to abandon also the remainder, rather than divide the House practically upon nothing.

Lord John Russell then briefly replied. He declined to adopt the suggestion of Mr. Disraeli, as he did not think it desirable to expose his whole plan to the risk of a defeat by a majority of the House, but he did think it desirable to take its opinion upon this portion of the subject. The Committee then divided on the question—“That the Chairman do now leave the Chair,” which was carried by 260 to 158: majority 102. The announcement of the numbers was received with cheering. The effect of the division was to prevent any proceeding at all on the Resolution.

In Committee of Supply on the 12th of June, Sir George Grey brought forward the Educational Estimates. The sum he moved was 151,000*l.*, in addition to 300,000*l.* which had already been voted. In explaining the proposed grant, he stated that the amount this year exceeded that of the last year by 54,292*l.* In defence of the extended vote, he reviewed the course of public education; showing that the increase of expenditure, since 1839, when it was 30,000*l.* only, and 1850, when it was 200,000*l.*, had been accompanied by a corresponding extension of education. In 1850, the number of pupil teachers was 4660; of Queen’s scholars, 39; of certificated masters and mistresses, 900; of inspectors, 19; of schools inspected, exclusive of 600 workhouse schools, 3098; of children examined, 214,873. In 1856, the number of pupil teachers had increased to 8524; of Queen’s scholars, to 972; of certificated

masters and mistresses, to 3432; of inspectors, to 36; of schools inspected, to 6966; of children examined, to 569,076. That afforded very satisfactory evidence of the advantages derived from Parliamentary grants. The increased expenditure was caused by the increase of pupil teachers, by the augmentation of salaries to masters and mistresses; the increase of capitation grants, extended to the whole country; and the new item of 10,000*l.* for industrial schools. It was not intended to apply any portion of the 10,000*l.* to the building of what were called "Reformatories" in the technical sense of the word, or establishments erected under the authority of Acts of Parliament for the reception of juvenile offenders.

Sir J. Pakington, expressing his entire concurrence in the statements of Sir G. Grey, and his thanks to the Government for proposing so liberal a vote, contended that the education was deficient in quality, and the provision insufficient in quantity, to supply the education requirements of the community. From the want of a better system we were rearing up a vast criminal class entirely ignorant of religion. An improved system, and money, were the two things wanted. The education of a child cost 6*d.*; the child contributed but 2*d.* towards that sum, and the question was how to supply the other 4*d.* He hoped that before the close of another Session some definite measure would be brought forward to make adequate provision for this deficiency.

Mr. Barnes moved that the vote be reduced to the sum voted the previous year, 396,921*l.*, on the ground that education by Privy

Council grants ought not to be extended, that the people had no more claim to public education than they had to public work, and that education should be left to the voluntary exertions of the country.

Mr. Milner Gibson replied to Mr. Barnes in defence of the existing system as better than nothing.

Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Alcock, Mr. Henley, Mr. Miles, Mr. W. J. Fox, and others, supported the vote, after which the amendment was negatived without a division, and the vote agreed to.

In the year 1852 a Commission was entrusted with the duty of inquiring respecting the University of Cambridge, its colleges, statutes, and the general state of the studies there. The Commissioners made their report to the Queen, and upon that report a Bill had been founded and introduced during the year 1855 in the House of Lords; but in consequence of its coming down to the House of Commons at a very late period of the Session it was ultimately withdrawn. A similar measure was introduced in the present Session, and on the 30th of May, on the motion for going into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Bouverie made an explanatory statement as to its principles and provisions, no discussion having taken place on the second reading. The income of the University, he observed, including the salaries of the professors, was 24,500*l.* per annum. This, however, was much exceeded by the aggregate incomes of the several colleges, which amounted to 185,000*l.* a year. Comparing this large revenue with the educational results, the contrast, he urged, was ludicrously small. In fact the number of

students who had in recent times been sent forth as well-educated men was not greater than it had been in 1632. Neither was the quality of the education imparted of so superior a degree as to make up for the deficiency in the number of students who availed themselves of the advantage. At a time when brain and not blood carried away the palm in the struggle of life, it was of the utmost consequence that the education afforded at the Universities should be of the highest class. So low was the repute into which Cambridge University had fallen, that multitudes of parents who could well bear the expense cared not to send their sons thither. The tests applied to students who were candidates only for an ordinary degree, after three years' residence in college, were of the lowest kind, and such as a boy of fifteen or sixteen could prepare himself to undergo in six weeks. He entered into details, from which he argued that in the three learned professions—theology, law, and medicine, the state of education in the University was eminently unsatisfactory, and that in those branches of science and learning which, though not immediately remunerative, were of the last importance in a commercial country, its shortcomings could not be disputed. If the University had enjoyed free action, the blame of these deficiencies would rest with it; but he did not blame the University, which he admitted had made great efforts to remedy them; its powers were, however, restrained and controlled, not only by external but by internal causes, and therefore it required the assistance of Parliament to enable it to amend the existing state of things. The

University was troubled, he said, with a most antiquated and confined constitution, the nature of which he explained, and then shortly detailed the changes proposed by the Bill with reference to the University and the colleges. He proposed to establish an elective senate, which would have power to originate a plan of education more consonant to the exigencies of the present times. The Bill would also sanction the establishment of private halls, and do away with the restrictions against the admission of Dissenters, so far as the University was concerned, leaving the colleges to act for themselves in this matter. There was besides a provision for a parliamentary commission, with extensive powers, which, however, he hoped and believed would be only exercised in the way of advice or control, and not in any objectionable manner whatsoever.

Mr. Walpole thought the right hon. Member had been led into exaggeration when disparaging the character and results of the education afforded at Cambridge University. The object of the Bill should, he contended, be to impose as little restriction as possible on the colleges, leaving them with the freest action that could be found consistent with the improvements which it was deemed desirable to carry out. Judging by what had been done by the University itself within the last thirty years in the way of improvement, he submitted that the point was very doubtful whether a more rapid and effectual progress would not be accomplished by continuing this voluntary process than by imposing any external authority. He was opposed to the establishment of private halls as in the case of

Oxford, but would not now resist them, believing that it was of great importance to render the two universities as similar as possible in their constitution. There was no provision in the Oxford Act for a Parliamentary commission to control its action, and he could see no necessity for such a power in the case of Cambridge. He entertained the strongest objection to this feature in the Bill, as calculated to interfere with the peace and tranquillity which it should be their object to maintain undisturbed. Intimating his intention to propose amendments in Committee, with the view of altering the provisions on which he had remarked, Mr. Walpole concluded with a warm and eloquent eulogy upon the University in the following terms:—"I am proud to say I belong to a university which, in science, has produced a Bacon and a Newton; which, in theology, can boast of a Barrow and a Jeremy Taylor; can show a Bentley for scholarship, a Porson for learning; whose sons in poetry have amused and instructed thousands upon thousands—a Spenser, a Cowley, a Milton, a Dryden, a Gray, a Byron; and if I were to refer to that profession for which my right hon. friend appears to think a Cambridge education does not qualify her sons—the profession of the law—then, I say, look to Coke, to Camden, to Ellenborough, to Thurlow. If we turn to the greatest statesmen of the country, none are more celebrated than the sagacious Burleigh, the prudent Walpole, and I might add one equal to the first as an orator—to any for honest and dignified efforts of statesmanship—William Pitt. If I forbear to bring forward other names inferior only to these I have

mentioned, it is simply because their recital would occupy the live-long night. So, also, I forbear to touch on names of living ornaments of Cambridge teaching lest I be accused of partiality or affection; but the noble Lord opposite (Lord Palmerston)—of whom Cambridge University is most justly proud—('Hear!')—will agree with me that there are three names which I may mention—living although the bearers are—as permanent examples of what a Cambridge education has done for her devoted sons. I take the brilliant genius, the amazing stores of literature and learning, that have so often charmed this House when Mr. Macaulay sat in it—('Hear, hear!')—and which charm us still when we read his works. I take another instance of one whose gigantic intellect has compassed almost every kind of knowledge—who, as tutor of his college, has devoted his energies to the advantage of the University in which now, as the master of his college and the Vice-Chancellor of the University, he has done and, I will undertake to say, will do more to improve and impart education than all the commissioners you can ever send there. ('Hear, hear!') One other name I refer to with peculiar pride, that of the eminent individual who is at the present moment the steward of his university—('Hear, hear!')—that remarkable man who won renown first as an under-graduate, then at the bar, then on the bench, then on the woolsack, and who at four-score years and four can vindicate the honour of his order and stand up for the rights of his country—('Hear, hear!')—that greatly gifted man, who brings to whatever he touches not only maturity of

judgment and the wisdom of age, but a vigour and elasticity of mind which the youngest among us may envy. Of course, I allude to Lord Lyndhurst."

After a brief discussion the House went into Committee. On clause 4, Mr. Stafford, in the absence of Lord John Manners, moved the omission of the words, "And no oath which may have been taken by any such officer shall be a bar to any authority of such Commissioners." This was negatived by 75 to 31. On clause 5, Mr. Heywood moved to omit the word "sixth" and substitute "first" of December. Negatived by 86 to 19. On clause 6, which provided that the Council of the Senate should consist of the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, four Heads of Colleges, four Professors of the University, and eight Members of the Senate, Mr. Heywood moved to leave out the words, "Four Heads of Colleges, four Professors of the University." Negatived by 102 to 38. A similar amendment, moved by Mr. Heywood, was also negatived by 111 to 63. In clause 7, requiring members of the Senate to reside at least twenty weeks at the University in every year, "fourteen" was substituted for "twenty," and the clause, as thus amended, was agreed to. In clause 24, the word "Principals" was substituted for "Licensed Masters," and the word "Hostel" for "Private halls." In the same clause, Mr. Wigram moved an amendment, providing that the students at private halls should attend Divine Worship; but this was negatived by 121 to 79. At clause 27 the Chairman reported progress. On the 9th of June the Bill was again in Committee, when

the consideration of the several remaining clauses was resumed and finished.

On clause 27, Mr. Heywood moved that the College statutes should hereafter be framed in the English language. Negatived by 74 to 58. Mr. Wigram moved the insertion of words providing that no endowment should be altered without due regard being had to the main design of the founder. Negatived by 97 to 78. Mr. Heywood moved a series of amendments,—that the colleges should have power to frame statutes regulating the duration of "headships;" that words should be inserted providing for the encouragement of studies in modern history, science, and languages; that students conscientiously objecting should be exempt from compulsory attendance at chapel. All these amendments were negatived by considerable majorities.

On clause 29, Mr. Fortescue moved the omission of words the effect of which would be to remove from the Bill the power given to two-thirds of the governing body of any college to put a veto on any scheme of the Commissioners. Negatived by 165 to 93.

The remaining clauses were agreed to with some slight amendments.

On the 4th of July, the House of Lords went into Committee on the Bill, and, with the exception of two, all the clauses were agreed to.

On clause 31, providing that the Commissioners may frame statutes for the University, Lord Lyttelton remarked, that under the clause only statutes passed by the Commissioners affecting certain gifts should be laid before the Council of the Senate. No such

limitation should exist, but all statutes should be laid before that body. He moved the omission of words to take away the limitation; and carried his amendment by 51 to 26.

On clause 44, which, as amended by Mr. Heywood's motion, would have the effect of admitting Dissenters to a share of the governing power, Lord Lyndhurst moved an amendment restoring the clause to its original state and excluding Dissenters. The alteration, he said, was proposed in a small House, and carried by a surprise. The University ought to be governed by members of the Church of England alone. Thereupon arose a smart debate, carried on by the Lord Chancellor and Lord Monteagle in favour of the clause as it stood, and by the Earl of Derby and the Bishop of St. David's in support of Lord Lyndhurst's amendment. On a division, the amendment was carried by 72 to 25.

On the 18th of July, the Bill came back to the Commons for the consideration of the Lords' amendments, when Mr. Bouverie moved that the House should agree to them. Mr. Heywood moved an amendment on clause 44, with the view of preserving the right of a Dissenter to a place in the Senate, but prohibiting him from taking part in proceedings affecting the course of theological studies. Negatived by 92 to 71. The Lords' amendments were finally agreed to by 90 to 73, and the Bill shortly afterwards received the Royal Assent.

An important discussion on the subject of education in Ireland was brought on in the House of Commons on the 17th of June by Mr. Walpole. The Church Edu-

cation Society in that country is formed of Protestants who have established schools there, competing, in some measure, with those established under the national system. The object of Mr. Walpole was to obtain for the Irish Church Education Society a share in the funds devoted by Parliament to education in Ireland. The resolution which he proposed for that purpose was in the following terms:—

“That a humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to direct that such modification may be made in the rules of the national system of Education in Ireland as will extend the advantages now enjoyed by non-vested schools to any other than vested schools now existing, or hereafter to be established, whatever their regulations may be as to the mode of religious instruction; provided that no children shall be compelled to learn any catechism, creed, or formulary, to which any parent or guardian may object; and provided that the patrons shall be willing to place such schools in connection with the Board, to permit the Board's control over books to be used in general instruction, and to receive officially the visits of the Government Inspectors.”

The House, he said, had agreed that they should work by private benevolence and public grants; that the grants from the public funds should be dispensed with an even hand; and that the education given should be based on religion. But in Ireland there was a religious body excluded from the benefit of the grants—the Church Education Society; and excluded solely because they required that

the Scriptures should be read in their schools. It was said that if grants were made to the Church Education Society, it would destroy the combined system of education: but that combined system did not exist. To meet the objections of the Presbyterians, the Scriptures had been admitted into their schools: to meet their objections, neither the joint application nor the joint management of Protestant and Catholic for grants was any longer insisted on; and their schools were allowed to be non-vested, that was, non-vested in the National Board. Out of 5000 schools only 1600 were vested; out of 4800 schools only 48 were under joint management. What then had become of the combined system? Thus, all other denominations had got their schools, and the Church only asked to educate its children to its own views. In those schools combined education existed, whereas it did not in the National schools. Mr. Walpole quoted the evidence of Archdeacon Stopford and others, to show that mixed education was carried out more successfully by the Church Education Society than by the Board of Education. The changes he should propose were identical with those proposed by Lord Derby to the Committee of the House of Lords. Lord Granville had also proposed resolutions similar in principle, — Lord Derby contemplating a salary to the teacher in addition to books and apparatus; Lord Granville proposing the latter only.

The motion was seconded by Sir W. Heathcote, who trusted it would not be opposed, its object being little more than to enable the National Board to cover ground in Ireland upon which it could not

at present set its foot, while it would get rid of a crying injustice which irritated many and benefited none.

Mr. Kennedy opposed the motion, contending that if it was carried it would revive all the bickerings and jealousies which the existing system had been framed to prevent, and would, by introducing a proselytizing influence, drive away three fourths of the attendants from the National schools. To meet the case of one-eighth of the population it was proposed to inflict an injustice on seven-eighths.

Mr. Horsman likewise resisted the motion, undertaking to show that it would be highly detrimental to the national interests, to the cause of education, and to the public peace in Ireland. He agreed with Mr. Walpole that religion should be the basis of education in Ireland; he differed from him when he supposed that religion did not enter very largely into the instruction given in the National Schools. Royal commissions and Parliamentary committees had declared that no plan of education could be effectual in Ireland unless it was well and clearly understood that no attempt would be made to influence or disturb the peculiar religious tenets of any sect or denomination. Was the House now prepared to say, he asked, that a system of education which involved such interference would be successful? If not, they could not adopt this motion, which declared, in effect, that it was advisable to interfere with religious tenets, and violated the fundamental principle upon which the National system of education in Ireland was founded. This system had been embraced by nine-tenths of the population, and was rejected by only a part of the

clergy and laity of the Established Church, who thereby excluded themselves from the grant. Since 1833, when the National system commenced, the number of its schools and pupils had increased yearly, numbering, in 1854, 5178 schools and 551,000 scholars, comprehending children of all denominations, who associated in harmony, as if they had been all of one creed; and, although there were 20,000 teachers, there had been no religious squabbles, and it had not been alleged that there was a single case of proselytism. He contrasted the rules of the National Board with those of the Church Educational Society with respect to religious instruction, and deduced from the falling off of the society's schools the conclusion that they were unpopular, because the society acted upon the false principle of endeavouring to make converts. He appealed to the testimony of eminent public men, who had been opponents of the National system, in commendation of its practical operation, and to the emphatic declaration of Lord Derby when in power, and of Lord Eglintoun, against such a change as was now sought to be made in the system. He could not, he said, reconcile Mr. Walpole's conduct in his present course with his presumed opinions upon this question as a member of Lord Derby's Cabinet in 1852. He denied that the united system had failed; even supposing it had failed as a united system, the first object was to give a good secular education; but he adduced evidence showing that a very large proportion of the schools were united schools. The system had failed only in conciliating a part of the clergy of the Established

Church of Ireland, who had set themselves in hostility to it and to the Legislature; and who, to the regret of many of their friends, called for a relaxation of it by the adoption of a plan repeatedly condemned, and which was repugnant to the principle of perfect religious freedom.

Mr. G. A. Hamilton supported the motion, which, he thought, by removing a sense of injustice which prevailed among Protestants in Ireland, would have the effect of settling this question, and rendering the system which it would supplement, not subvert, efficient, by enabling all parties to avail themselves of it. He read statements from the census of 1851, showing the state of education in all the districts of Ireland, rural and civic. It appeared that education reached its highest point in the period between 1817 and 1837, and fell between 1837 and 1842. Education thus seemed to have reached its highest point under the system which preceded what was termed "the national system." It appeared from the statements of the commissioners, that, on a comparison of the census of 1841 with that of 1851, there had, at the latter period, been a considerable increase in twenty-one counties in the proportion of males between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five who could neither read nor write. It turned out, therefore, that in the ten years from 1841 to 1851, notwithstanding the establishment of the national system of education, which was said to have produced such marvellous effects, ignorance had been progressing in Ireland among the male population between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five. He found that in the county of

Wexford the increase in the number of illiterate males in 1851 as compared with 1841 was four per cent., while the number of national schools, which was 44 in 1841, was 108 in 1851. In Wicklow the increase of ignorance within the same period had been four per cent., while the number of national schools was 39 in 1841, and 72 in 1851. The increase of ignorance in Clare had been one per cent. and the number of national schools in that county in 1841 was 33, while in 1851 it was 130. In the twenty-one counties to which the commissioners referred there were 1505 national schools in 1841, and 2971 in 1851. He thought, then, it could not be maintained that education in Ireland had progressed in a degree at all commensurate with the increase of national schools. It had been admitted that education should be based upon religion; for this purpose religion must be taught in the schools, and the Bible should in a Protestant State be held out as containing the revealed will of God. The national system, however, did not do this, but ignored this principle, and was therefore defective.

Mr. Napier took a similar view, and observed, that the scheme of the National system was an experiment; but under it a national education was not obtained, and Mr. Walpole asked that the system should be extended. The motion did not propose to add any restrictions; it would remove restrictions, so as to include other schools, and make the system a really national one. He asked that the same principle might be applied to the Protestants of Ireland as had been applied in England, and even in India, where no

exclusive condition was attached to educational grants. The Church Education Society, under the present rules, were placed in a worse position than any other religious class in Ireland; whereas they ought to be in as good a position as their brethren of the Church of England.

Mr. Deasy and Mr. Hughes opposed the motion. A motion, by Mr. De Vere, for the adjournment of the debate, was then negatived by 184 against 32, and the House divided on the original question, which was carried against the Government by 113 to 103, an announcement which was received with loud cheers.

The motion for an Address to the Crown, which was thus carried, was considered by the Ministry and their supporters, in spirit and effect, although not in terms, a decided inroad upon the system of National Education. It was felt that the matter could not rest as it was if the system of National Education was to be maintained in Ireland. Mr. Fortescue, therefore, on the 23rd of June, with a view to reverse this vote, moved a counter-resolution to the effect that the House had observed with satisfaction the progress made in the instruction of the poorer classes of Her Majesty's Irish subjects under the direction of the Commissioners of National Education, and was of opinion that in the administration of that system there should be maintained a strict and undeviating adherence to its fundamental principles, by excluding all compulsory religious teaching, being convinced that no plan for the education of the Irish poor could be carried into effectual operation unless it was explicitly avowed and clearly understood

that no attempt should be made to influence or disturb the peculiar religious tenets of any sect or denomination of Christians. In taking the unusual course of asking the House to go back to a vote which it had already agreed to, and to review that decision, he thought himself excused, he said, by the unusual circumstances of the case, to which he briefly referred. After reading the terms of the Address which had been voted by the House and the principal rule of the National Commissioners,—the principle of which was embodied in his resolution, he observed that the advocates of the change alleged that the object of the national system was to afford a combined education; that this object had failed, and that Parliament was called upon to adopt another system—that of the Church Education Society. He, however, denied that there had been an entire failure of the combined system, appealing to statements of figures in support of his denial, and contended that the new rule suggested in the Address, and which corresponded with the principle enunciated by the Church Education Society, tended to undermine and subvert the national system, and ran counter to the current of educational legislation in England. The new rule, if adopted, must be extended further than was contemplated in the Address; the grants must be enlarged and made permanent. And for whose benefit was the change asked? Not specifically for the children of members of the Established Church; it was sought for the purpose of enabling the clergy of that Church to give the religious education they desired to the children of members of other churches. He

hoped that the House, while it respected claims founded upon conscientious scruples, would not concede such a change to the claims of the Irish Church.

Mr. Kirk seconded the motion.

Mr. Walpole said two grave questions were raised by the resolution; one materially affected the relations of that House with the Crown; the other related more particularly to the merits of the motion. With regard to the first, he was of opinion that when an Address was voted to the Crown the House should not lightly recur to the subject until it had received an answer to the Address, and this was the ordinary rule. A contrary proceeding would place the House in a false position, unseemly as regarded the Crown. The resolution rested upon two grounds—first, that the Address agreed to on the 17th, if adopted as it was, would subvert the national system; secondly, that the necessary consequence of the Address was to substitute a new system of education in Ireland which would have the effect of enabling persons to proselytize children of another faith. As to the first, he defied any one to point out in the terms of the Address, or in the observations he made, any intention to subvert the national system, which his object was to supplement, by giving to every class and portion of the community a share of the grant, of which they should not be deprived by any regulation which interfered with conscientious scruples. With respect to the second reason, that he desired to substitute for a rule of the National Board another rule of the Church Education Society, which would facilitate proselytism, this argument proceeded, he said, upon the false

assumption that he entertained such intention, whereas he had never made an observation that could lead any one to infer that he would willingly interfere with parental authority or the rights of conscience, or compel particular religious teaching; on the contrary, he held that such an attempt ought not to be made, and if his proposition could not be carried into effect without those consequences, he would be the first man to say the Address ought not to stand. But there was nothing in it which led to that conclusion. With respect to Mr. Fortescue's resolution, he believed it quite harmonised with the Address, though he could not consent to it if it amounted to a rescission of the Address; but, believing that it amounted only to a revision of it, he was willing to adopt the resolution, in order to remove any doubt as to the intention of the Address. He took the Address and the resolution together, and considered them as embodying one proposition, that it was most unjust to deprive any part of the community of a share of a public grant, while no attempt should be made to interfere with parental authority, or invade the rights of conscience, leaving to the National Board the duty of framing the regulations by which these principles should be carried out.

Mr. Labouchere said that in his opinion the effect of Mr. Walpole's motion would have been to inflict a death-blow upon the united system of education; but he believed that Mr. Fortescue's resolution would satisfy the public mind in Ireland, and he rejoiced that Mr. Walpole had consented to support it.

Mr. Cairns insisted it was the

duty of the Government to have proposed to rescind the Address. He supported the views of Mr. Walpole, and eulogised the general system of education.

Lord John Russell began by dwelling on the embarrassment which arose from the rule of the House allowing an Address to the Crown to go out of their hands upon only one deliberation. As regarded the question before them, he should be quite ready to come to a direct reversal of the vote of Tuesday. The only fault he had to find with Mr. Fortescue's motion was, that it was not of a more direct and specific character. Mr. Fortescue said his proposition reversed the decision of the other night: Mr. Walpole took it in his hands, and, by something like ingenious Chancery pleading, made it quite consistent with the Address, to which Mr. Fortescue was entirely opposed. While the present Government remained in power, no material alteration would be made in the national system; but if Mr. Walpole were once more Home Secretary, he would revert both to the Address and the resolution, and declare that they were confirmatory and explanatory one of the other. That was a rather awkward position in which to place the House. But as there was no other course open to him, Lord John said he should vote for Mr. Fortescue's resolution. He vindicated at length the existing system; viewed Mr. Walpole's proposal as an attempt to subvert it; and said that if it were to be altered, "let right honourable gentlemen opposite carry those alterations into effect, and reap the bitter fruits of them."

Mr. Napier argued in support of the modifications proposed in

[N]

the Address, and urged upon the Ministry that an opportunity now offered for settling this question of education in Ireland. He taunted Lord John Russell with advocating the use of the Bible in schools at the British and Foreign School Society, and then coming to the House of Commons and charging Irish Protestants with desiring supremacy because they advocated that very principle.

Mr. Horsman pointed out the inconsistency of adhering to an Address which set up the plan of the Church Education Society, and adopting a resolution which affirmed the existing system of the National Board. The result of the former, he observed, would be to establish in Ireland denominational schools, instead of national, and the attempt would introduce inequality and confusion. The only persons hostile to the existing system was a section of the established clergy of Ireland; but the resolution, to which all sides of the House assented, affirmed that that system had been successful, that its principle was a sound one, and that it ought to be supported.

Mr. P. O'Brien spoke against the Address, and Mr. Grogan moved to add at the end of the resolution the following words:—"But that, consistently with these principles, the House is of opinion that no school should be disentitled to receive aid from the funds of the Board because the rules of such school require that a portion of the Scriptures should be read each day by each child, as part of the general instruction of the school."

This amendment was supported by Mr. G. A. Hamilton.

A motion that the debate be adjourned was then negatived, as was

also another, that the House do adjourn.

In reply to a question, what interpretation the Government would put upon the resolution, Lord Palmerston said they understood that if it should be affirmed it would be the opinion of the House that no change should be made in the regulations and practice in administering the public grant for education in Ireland. The House had to determine whether the system of education which had conferred so much benefit upon that country was to continue or be abandoned—whether religious peace should be established, or religious war be declared.

Mr. Disraeli said it was and had been his intention to vote for the resolution to support on its fundamental principle the system of national education in Ireland as it at present existed; but he was open to agree to all modifications consistent with that principle.

The House then divided upon Mr. Grogan's amendment, which was negatived by 282 to 95, after which the original resolution was agreed to.

On the evening of the 26th, Lord Drumlanrig, Controller of the Household, appeared at the bar of the House of Commons with the Queen's answer to Mr. Walpole's Address. It was as follows:—

"I fully recognise the duty of extending as widely as possible the blessing of education in Ireland; and your wishes and recommendations will always receive the consideration justly due to them. It affords me great satisfaction to know that experience has proved the existing system of national education in Ireland to have greatly promoted this important object. It

is my earnest desire to see that system upheld and strengthened by a strict adherence to those rules which, by excluding all compulsory religious teaching, have hitherto secured parental authority, the rights of conscience, and the religious liberty, of all denominations of Christians."

The attention of the House of Commons was also occupied in the course of the Session by the Maynooth grant. The question was brought forward by Mr. Spooner on the 15th of April, who moved that the House should go into Committee, "for the purpose of considering the Acts for the Endowment of the College of Maynooth, with a view to the withdrawal of any endowment out of the Consolidated Fund, due regard being had to vested rights or interests." As no new facts or arguments were adduced either by the supporters or opponents of the measure in the course of the various discussions which ensued, and as the old ones have been so frequently recorded in our former volumes, we shall confine ourselves to a statement of an outline of the results. On a division, there appeared for Mr. Spooner's resolution, 159; against it, 133; majority for the resolution and against the Government, 26. Thereupon the House went into Committee, with Mr. Newdegate in the chair, when, after some discussion and an unsuccessful division on a hostile amendment, the Committee divided on the main question—the introduction of the Bill—when the Government were again defeated, the numbers being, ayes, 159; noes, 142; majority, 17. The House having resumed and leave been given, the Bill was shortly after brought in and read

for the first time. On the 25th of June, Mr. Spooner moved the second reading, when Mr. Henry Herbert moved an amendment, that the Bill should be read a second time that day six months. The only noticeable incident in the debate which ensued was that of Sir John Pakington rising and frankly declaring that he had intentionally absented himself when the question was last discussed, because he did not wish to be pledged either way. He had hoped that Mr. Spooner's Bill would have been fair to the Roman Catholics, so that he could have supported it; but it merely reversed the policy of half a century. "The time has arrived" when those accustomed to take part in the proceedings of the House should frankly state their views; and Sir John, for one, felt bound to say that neither as regards Maynooth, nor as regarded the larger question of national education, was he prepared to reverse the policy pursued by this country in Ireland. "I can be no party to any step which may injure or impair the system of education in Ireland." The wise policy was to maintain things as they were. Deprecating the periodic excitement on this subject, he suggested that some mode might be adopted to put an end to these annual grants, on a footing to which the Roman Catholics would consent. On a division, Mr. H. Herbert's amendment was negatived by 174 to 168; majority, 6; and the Government were thus a third time defeated upon the main question. This, however, was the last triumph of Mr. Spooner and his friends; for on the next day he moved that the order for the second reading of the Bill should be discharged,

finding that, from the determined hostility of his opponents, and the obstacles thrown in his way, further progress was hopeless during the Session.

The only remaining noticeable event of the Session connected with the subject of education was a Bill brought in by Sir George Grey, and subsequently passed into a

law, for the appointment of a Vice-President of the Committee of Council of Education. The object of the measure was to secure a responsible Minister, having a seat in Parliament, in whose hands the duty of administering the grants and superintending the department of education should be centralized.

CHAPTER VIII.

CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS.—*Motion by Lord Goderich—Statement by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as to the Results of Competitive Examination—Motion by General Evans, relative to the Abolition of the Sale of Commissions in the Army—A debate ensues, in which the principal speakers are Lord Goderich, Mr. F. Peel, Lord Stanley, Mr. Sidney Herbert, and Lord Palmerston—The Motion is withdrawn—Military Education, Mr. Sidney Herbert calls attention to the state of—His Speech—Observations of Mr. Peel, Lord Palmerston, General Evans, Lord Goderich, and other Members.—AFFAIRS OF INDIA.—The Earl of Albemarle moves Resolutions, and makes a Statement in the House of Lords on the subject of the use of Torture in India—Speeches of the Duke of Argyll, the Earl of Ellenborough, and other Peers—In the House of Commons, Sir E. Perry calls attention to the increasing Deficit in the Revenue of India—Reply of Mr. V. Smith—And observations of Mr. Otway, Sir J. Hogg, and Mr. J. G. Phillimore—Indian Budget introduced by Mr. Vernon Smith—Comments of Sir E. Perry, Sir J. Hogg, Mr. Headlam, Mr. Otway, Mr. Danby Seymour, and Mr. I. Butt—Elaborate Review of the Parliamentary Session by Mr. Disraeli—Reply of Lord Palmerston—Mr. M. Gibson, Mr. Napier, Mr. Mowbray, Mr. Baines, Mr. Lowe, and others, make observations—Parliament Prorogued by Commission—The Queen's Speech—Statistical results of the Session—Law Reforms introduced by the Lord Chancellor and Sir Fitzroy Kelly respectively.*

A MOTION by Lord Goderich, on the 9th of July, that the House of Commons should resolve itself into a Committee on the Civil Service, elicited some interesting information on the subject of the Civil Service appointments from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who said he wished to give such an explanation as might induce Lord Goderich not to proceed with his motion. He stated that the subject had been discussed early in the Session. The House having resolved, on the 24th of April, to go into Committee on the following day upon an Address for appointments by open competition.

Since that time the motion had stood over, but the system then in force had continued in operation, and he proceeded to give the number of examinations and appointments from May, 1855, to the 30th of June, 1856.

The number of candidates nominated was 2390; of these 1055 were examined in London, and 693 in the provinces; making a total of 1748 persons examined. Certificates were granted to 564 persons on the London examinations, to 445 persons on the provincial examinations, and to 61 persons on the reports of heads of departments, making a total of 1070

persons to whom certificates were granted. The number of certificates refused on the London examinations was 318, and on the provincial 238; making a total of 556 certificates refused against 1070 granted. Therefore the result was as nearly as possible that two persons succeeded in obtaining certificates to one who failed. That had been the practical result of the existing system up to the present time; and the House would see that it had the effect of separating the worthy from the unworthy candidates. Lord Goderich had proposed that any persons who offered might compete. Under the plan at present in operation, the heads of departments, who had a strong interest in obtaining efficient servants, selected several candidates for examination; and it was their study to present such candidates as would enable the Civil Service Commissioners to select fit men. The system now in operation, therefore, offered satisfactory securities for good appointments. But the system of literary competitive examinations was not suited to a numerous class like tide-waiters and country letter-carriers. The experience of the Civil Service Commissioners was in favour of a gradual and cautious extension of the principle of appointments by competition. But how was that principle to be extended? If all appointments were made on the principle of competition, all the candidates must be brought to one place to compete; and if London, Edinburgh, and Dublin were selected as the places of examination, they would enjoy a monopoly. That showed the difficulty of laying down any universal rules on the subject. But means might be

found for having examinations in different parts of the country, and of gradually adopting the principle recommended by Lord Goderich.

Sir Stafford Northcote submitted to Lord Goderich, whether, after this explanation, it would not be desirable to discharge the order. Lord Goderich said, that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had spoken in this way on a former occasion, he should have left the question in the hands of the Government. Nothing could be more satisfactory than the speech just delivered, and he was willing that the order should be discharged; undertaking, however, to bring the subject forward again if the Government did not act up to the Chancellor of the Exchequer's speech.—Order discharged.

On the 4th of March, the House of Commons was occupied by a discussion on the system of sale and purchase of commissions in the army. It arose on the motion of General Sir De Lacy Evans for a Select Committee to consider and examine evidence, and report to the House on the expediency of abolishing the existing system, and on the means which might be adopted for the accomplishment of that object. After asking the indulgent consideration of the House owing to the state of his health, General Evans proceeded to say that the system of sale and purchase, which he wished to abolish, was a stain upon the service, and a dishonour to England. The value of commissions held by officers was by one return 5,400,000*l.*, and by another 8,068,000*l.*; adding 40 per cent. for sums paid over the regulation-price, the value of commissions would be 8,000,000*l.* by the first, and 11,000,000*l.* by the second return. Only the

strongest reasons could justify the imposition of such a tax upon officers. It had been said that the arrangement was an economical one, enabling officers to retire without a pension. But it should be remembered, that in consequence of this imposition the emoluments of officers in the higher ranks were greater than they otherwise would be. If men were promoted by merit, it was said that there would be a difficulty in making selections in time of peace, and that if attempted it would "degenerate into a system of seniority." He did not recognise the propriety of that expression. In the artillery all promotion was by seniority, and "yet our artillery was about the best in the world." Not the least of the abuses of the present system was the distress and misery it caused to meritorious officers without money; and many officers of great merit had left the army because they could not buy promotion. In abolishing the system, there was no necessity to confiscate the property of officers, nor to put the country to any great expense. The system would die out of itself if the Horse Guards would determine that no future commissions should be bought or sold. There could be no worse economy than to maintain that system unchanged; for if there should be an incompetent general at the head of the army in time of war, the disasters occasioned by his incapacity might in a single campaign cover the expenditure of a peace army for two or three years together. If Lord Palmerston thought a Commission would be preferable to a Committee, he would modify his motion to that effect.

In seconding the motion, Lord Goderich adduced a variety of reasons for a change, insisting strongly upon the argument touched upon by General Evans, that officers who purchased their advancement in the army might be said to serve their country for nothing, and contending that it was most unwise and contrary to sound policy that any persons employed in the public service should be able to say that their services were gratuitous, more especially when the country was no pecuniary gainer thereby. The present system had created vested rights which of themselves were great obstacles to reform, and enabled officers to hold language to the Government like that used in the memorial of the Guards, where an order of the Sovereign is called a "breach of faith,"—language such as would not be permitted in any other army in Europe. The system of purchase was not economical, for the pay of the officers was the same as if purchase did not exist. It was an obstacle to the improvement of military education, which had been admitted to be "mischievously low," and was not much improved by what Sir Howard Douglas called the "ridiculously trivial examination" at present insisted on. It was said that the purchase system led to rapid promotion: yet at the commencement of the war that system gave us generals of seventy and captains of eighteen. The system of promotion was the reverse of what it ought to be; for there was no seniority in the lower ranks of the army; seniority began just where it should end; and the consequence was, that men in the vigour of life did not hold the highest posts in the army. Lord Goderich

described at some length the systems of promotion in the Sardinian, the Russian, and the French armies; and contended that our system ought to combine seniority and merit, similar to that of Sardinia.

In the debate which followed, the existing system was supported by Sir J. Fitzgerald, Colonels Lindsay and North, and Mr. Peel, the Under Secretary for War, who was the most prominent speaker. The sale and purchase of commissions, he admitted, was not in theory free from objection; but it had existed for one hundred and fifty years, it had accommodated itself to the system, it worked well, and it could not easily be displaced. No proof had been given that the practice operated perniciously on the general interests of the army. If it were abolished to-morrow, no new class of officers would thereby be introduced into service; and a plan of education up to any standard might be engrafted on the present system. The abolition of purchase would necessitate a heavy expense for full and half-pay retiring allowances; and the adoption of the rule of seniority would fill the army with old officers. There were three systems of promotion in operation — purchase, seniority, and selection — all co-ordinate and harmoniously combined; and the adoption of either by itself would be attended with great practical difficulty and inconvenience. To get rid of one of these rules of promotion, that by purchase, the House would have to assent to a prodigal and wasteful expenditure of 8,000,000*l.*

Mr. Ellice and Mr. M. Milnes thought that the subject ought to be judicially investigated by a Royal Commission, and that it

would be imprudent in the Government to pass it over. On the other hand, Lord Stanley, Mr. Rich, Mr. Headlam, and Colonel Adair argued against the existing system.

Lord Stanley urged the necessity of instituting an inquiry. If it were postponed, he feared it would soon be forgotten or neglected. The present system was the purchase by private persons of a vested interest in the public service. In no country in the world did such a system as that of purchasing commissions exist; it did not exist in our own navy. It was essentially anomalous, and a departure from general rules, and could be defended only upon the ground that it existed, and that to abolish it would lead to greater evils. As to the money question, he confessed it was not to be disregarded; but, after all, the highest estimate ever made of the value of commissions — namely, 8,000,000*l.* — amounted only to one-half the sum which was yearly voted by the House in time of peace for naval and military services; and that sacrifice, whatever it might be, the country would not be called upon to make at one time, or in one sum; but it would be scattered over a long series of years. The system of purchase was not an integral part of our military system, it was an excrescence which had grown up in the course of time. There were, he observed, two questions in this case: — first, should the existing system be abolished, aye or no; secondly, what particular mode of promotion should be substituted. The first he answered in the affirmative; the system was unsound in principle and mischievous in practice. With respect to the second question, without suggest-

ing a specific mode, he said, let there be a full investigation, and he believed that the result of the evidence and of the report of the Committee would be, that in five years from hence the purchase system would cease.

Mr. Sidney Herbert contended that it would never do simply to abolish the purchase system, for that would lead to a dead lock from the age of the officers. Not objecting to the promotion of men from the ranks, he argued that it was of importance that the officers should be mainly gentlemen, because they were better able to exact that implicit obedience so necessary. In the navy there was selection by merit, from the bottom, but not up to the top. At the bottom, when you knew nothing of your men, you selected them; at the top, when you know them, you take them by seniority. But in the navy, except putting shot into the guns, all the duties were performed in peace that were performed in war. The army was particularly a fighting corps; in peace it was not strictly an army, and it was not exercised as an army. You could tell what your officers could do; and therefore you could draw from the navy an analogy in favour of selection. He would be very glad to see purchase put an end to above the rank of captain. He deprecated handing over the subject to a Committee of that House, doubting whether the House was sufficiently conversant with the details, and whether its decision would be so satisfactory as that of a mixed Commission of military officers and civilians.

Lord Palmerston said his opinion in the abstract was against the system of purchase. No one would propose such a system if

we were establishing an army for the first time, and it existed only in the British army. But, on the other hand, it must be admitted that the system had existed so long, and had become so interwoven with all the arrangements of that great establishment, that if it was desired to abolish purchase in the army great consideration was necessary, for it could not be denied that the system, good or bad in itself, had, in process of time, become associated with circumstances advantageous, in some degree, to the army. If purchase was to be abolished, some system must be established by which officers who by age and infirmity had grown unfit for their duties could be removed, and that involved expense. The officers who had purchased their commissions must be entitled to receive compensation, and that would be attended with very considerable expense. The House seemed to agree that this was a matter which ought to be inquired into. He thought, with Mr. Herbert, that that House was not so well adapted for this inquiry as a commission, and if Sir De Lacy Evans would waive his motion, he undertook that a mixed Commission of civilians and military men should be appointed to pursue the inquiry begun by a former Commission on army promotions.

Upon this understanding, General Evans withdrew the motion.

On the 5th of June, in the House of Commons, Mr. Sidney Herbert, on the motion for going into Committee of Supply, brought under notice the state of the education and instruction of officers in the army, and at the same time, in a very able speech, developed his own ideas upon military educa-

tion. He treated the subject in a full and detailed manner, and occupied a considerable time in the elucidation of his views to the manifest satisfaction of the House. At the beginning of his address, he remarked, with regret, that one item—the vote for the education and instruction of the officers of the army—had disappeared from the revised estimates; and he hoped that before those estimates were discussed, provision would be made for the education of regimental and staff officers. At that moment we had an opportunity of creating *de novo* a peace establishment free from the errors and vices of the establishment hurriedly created after the close of the great war. “In 1816, the petition called the London Petition, was presented, protesting against the maintenance of the army, although that army had been reduced to a great amount—as incompatible with the constitution and prosperity of the country, and as sapping the foundation of national liberties; and so strong was this feeling, that the Duke of Wellington held an opinion which he expressed to myself not many years ago, when I proposed that there should be an encampment of a large body of men for instruction in field-duties. The Duke of Wellington refused to listen to that proposal, and founded his objection upon the feeling of the country towards the army after the war. He said, ‘Depend upon it, the only way to maintain an army in this country is to keep it out of sight.’ I think it probable that the unpopularity of the army at the period in question arose from its having been used as a police force in the repression of political disturbances.” Now, a

new organisation would greatly facilitate instruction. They must aim at making their training and efficiency compensate for the numerical inferiority of their army. They must not reduce those corps where the necessity for science was the greatest and the necessary amount of training was the longest. The expense of maintaining an efficient army was nothing to that required to maintain a large army completely uninstructed. You would not expand a scientific corps upon a sudden, but you would much more rapidly expand cavalry and infantry. It was far less difficult to carry out a plan of education than formerly. The popular fallacies, the opinion as to the non-necessity of instruction to officers, had been dissipated by the experience of the late war. He reminded the House that the Duke of Wellington proposed a plan of examination in 1850; quoted evidence of its necessity, from the testimony of Lieutenant-Colonel Adams, Colonel Prosser, and Napoleon: quoting the following remarkable sentence dictated by him to Montholon at St. Helena. “Brought to France when 14, Louis entered on the life of a man at the siege of Toulon on hearing me say to him, in the midst of the corpses of 200 grenadiers slain through the ignorance of their commander, at the assault of an impregnable side of Fort Pharon: ‘If I had commanded here, all these brave men would be still alive. Learn, Louis, from this example, how absolutely necessary instruction is to those who aspire to command others.’” He also refuted the objections of Sir John Burgoyne. Mr. Herbert then proceeded to unfold his plan, in great detail; and having gone through that ela-

borate exposition, he succinctly recapitulated its chief points. "I propose to do away with all military education before the age of sixteen. I propose to admit students in larger numbers to Sandhurst. I propose to admit them by one uniform standard; but I also propose to admit those who have not attended any military college if able to pass the same examination. I propose further, to establish at the head-quarters of every division a staff-officer for the instruction of sub-officers, and to subject the latter to an examination uniform throughout England and the Colonies. I propose to remove the senior department from Sandhurst to Farnham, and to render the education there more practical and military in its character. I propose, lastly, that every officer who serves on the Staff shall pass through the Staff school, and attach himself for three years to the different branches of the service." The whole army required to be inoculated with greater professional spirit; the evil of young men entering the army for amusement must be corrected. The way to do that was to supply a good military education for officers.. "I would now beg to press this subject upon the attention of the Government, hoping that they will take it up. If they do so, public opinion will support them. Recollect, that by every day's delay you raise up fresh difficulties; the recollection of past evils will pass away; people will begin to acquiesce in the old routine; and, above all, you create fresh barriers to the efficiency of the army by admitting more uninstructed and incompetent officers; you create vested interests, and postpone to

an indefinite period the ultimate attainment of this desirable object."

Mr. Herbert sat down amidst loud cheers, chiefly from the Opposition.

Mr. Peel made a guarded reply; admitting the soundness of Mr. Herbert's views in principle, but declining to be bound by the detail. He argued, however, against any attempt to apply an educational test solely, and still more against the proposed uniform standard. Government had not shown any undue procrastination in dealing with the question. A Committee was formed some time ago by the War Department for the purpose of inquiring into the scientific requirements for the army; that Committee recommended the appointment of a Commission, whose duty it would be to go to the Continent and obtain information as to the systems pursued there. The gentlemen appointed had brought back valuable information from Prussia, France, Belgium, Switzerland, and other countries; and in a few days they would present their report.

Mr. Ellice, Sir De Lacy Evans, Mr. Rich, and Lord Goderich highly complimented Mr. Herbert, and insisted on the necessity of some measures which would effect the objects he had so admirably explained.

Lord Palmerston thanked Mr. Herbert for the able and clear manner in which he had stated his views. The Government, he said, concurred with him and other speakers in bearing their testimony to the high importance of officers in the army having the best possible education adapted to their professional functions, and they admitted that the present

system was capable of improvement, and that it was their duty to use their utmost exertions to make the best arrangements for effecting that improvement. The House could not expect, he said, that he should follow the details into which Mr. Herbert had entered; but they should receive the best consideration of the Government. Two things were to be desired in officers of the army. Some persons argued in favour of high literary qualifications; but this object, though not to be neglected, might be carried too far. A certain extent of literary acquirements was a test of competency; but the instruction should be directed more to professional acquirements.

"The main qualities for an officer," Lord Palmerston observed, "are contempt of danger, fearlessness of responsibility, a quick eye to estimate the nature of surrounding circumstances, a rapid decision how to act in every emergency, and resolution to take the course which upon reflection he may think best. These are qualities the possession of which by an officer is most important, and which may be found in a man who is deficient in many of those attainments which, nevertheless, are essential to giving these qualities their best and most useful application. What we want is to combine the two; and you cannot by any examination ascertain exactly whether or not a man possesses these constitutional qualities. . . . You must take your chance. All that you can do is by instruction, to give to your officers that scientific knowledge which is essential to their professional pursuits, and to the well-conducting of the troops who may be placed

under their command; and by examination, to ascertain whether they have profited by the instruction which you have afforded them. . . . Now that peace has fortunately returned, however, it will be the duty and the anxious desire of the Government, as soon as possible, to come to some satisfactory decision upon the arrangements necessary to accomplish the objects which my right honourable friend has in view."

The discussion then ended.

In the House of Lords, on the 14th of April, the Earl of Albemarle presented a petition from certain inhabitants of Madras complaining of the infliction of torture by the officers of the Government, and praying for protection. He moved four resolutions, declaring that the report of the Commission had proved to the entire conviction of the House that torture was still practised throughout the twenty provinces constituting the Presidency of Madras; that although clandestine and illegal, it had been for many years known and admitted by the constituted authorities at home and in India, that the House viewed the practice "as repugnant to natural justice, abhorrent to humanity, and disgraceful to the character of this nation;" and pledging the House "to pursue the speediest and most effectual measures within its power for the annihilation of the odious and barbarous practice of torture within the above-mentioned Government and Presidency of Madras."

The report of the Torture Commission, he said, must be taken as only a sample of the way in which the East India Company administered justice and collected revenue. The Commissioners

themselves, in stating that a full inquiry would have occupied two years, instead of three months—the time they were employed—admitted its incompleteness. From the dispatch of the Court of Directors to the Governor of Madras in September last, the House might infer that the torture was of a mild description; but to correct that impression, Lord Albemarle read a list of thirty-four different modes of torture which he had extracted from the report of the Commissioners; among which were deprivation of food and water; hindering a man from sleeping; hanging a necklace of bones or other disgusting materials round the neck (a punishment peculiarly offensive to a Hindoo); compelling a man to sit on his heels, with brickbats or sharp stones under his hams: striking the heads of two defaulters against each other; tying two persons together in a stooping posture by the hair of their heads; tying a man in a stooping posture to the wheel of a cart; tying a man by the hair of his head to the tail of an ass and parading him through the market; forcing a man into a stooping posture with another man on his back; binding a man to one tree and hoisting his leg by a rope attached to another; suspending a man by his heels to the bough of a tree; suspending him by the wrist and scourging him while in the air: placing the victim on a nest of red ants; pounding the joints with mallets of soft wood; flagellation with every kind of scourge in every part of the human body, and with such severity as occasionally to cause death; tying rags round the fingers and setting fire to them; burning various parts of the body with a

lighted cheroot, heating packing-needles and searing-irons; wrapping the body in cotton steeped in oil, and setting fire to it; compression of the sensitive organs of the body; driving thorns under the nails; filling the nostrils, eyes, and other parts of the body with cayenne-pepper: &c., &c.

The Directors had expressed their satisfaction that the European officers were acquitted by the Commissioners of all acquaintance with the existence of torture: Lord Albemarle, however, quoted passages from six different witnesses, all of whom agreed in stating that the people believed that the practice of torture was “connived at,” or “tacitly tolerated” by the European officers. The civil servants in India could not have been ignorant of the existence of torture. The Honourable Walter Elliott, in a report on the subject, stated that of two hundred and fifteen answers elicited, only seven expressed disbelief, seventeen give no opinion, while one hundred and ninety-seven “concur in stating their belief in the prevalence of the evil to a greater or less degree.” Lord Albemarle could not acquit the Indian civil servants of “all acquaintance” with the existence of this practice. Connivance of some kind was shown by their universal repugnance to convict a subordinate, even on the strongest evidence.

The Duke of Argyll stated that the Government viewed the practice of torture with abhorrence and detestation; and denied that there had been any complicity on their part, or that they had sanctioned the practice. The facts ought to be completely stated, and not in a manner that would convey an erroneous impression to

the people of this or foreign countries. When the Committee of both Houses sat to inquire into the renewal of the Company's charter, they did not hear one whisper of the existence of torture. It had been said that the inquiry was not sufficient; but if the practice of torture was notorious, it would have been one of the first and most obvious weapons of attack. When a Member of the other House stated that torture was practised in the Presidency of Madras, Sir Charles Wood said he could not deny the charge, as he had never before heard of it; but a strict inquiry should be made. Accordingly a Commission was appointed in September, 1854, and in April, 1855 their report was concluded. That did not show any reluctance on the part of the Indian Government to inquire into the subject. The practice of torture did not originate under British rule; it was inherited from the great empires that preceded ours. The Commissioners said that the natives looked upon torture in criminal cases as necessary and right; "it excites no abhorrence, no astonishment, no repugnance in their minds." It was practised in every relation of domestic life. "There is not a native public servant who does not know well that these practices are held in abhorrence by his European superiors." The Duke quoted several passages from the report to show that the British Government had not connived at the continuance of torture; that the natives were not impressed with an idea that their "maltreatment" was countenanced or tolerated by the European officers of Government; and that few missionaries, civil engineers, or even medical

men, could testify to their personal knowledge of its existence. But at the same time he admitted, that since 1810 the Court of Directors had on ten separate occasions issued orders to put it down. He fully concurred in the desirableness of separating the revenue from the police departments—views in which Lord Harris also cordially concurred. There were great difficulties in the way; but the whole subject was engaging the serious attention of the Government, not only in England but in Madras. The Duke proposed some verbal alterations in Lord Albemarle's resolutions, which made them read as follows:—

"That, by a report lately laid on the table, it is proved to the entire conviction of the House, that torture, or the infliction of pain for the purpose of confession or extortion, has long been practised in India; and that, though derived from former governments, and steadily decreasing both in severity and extent under British rule, it still continues to be practised by the native officers of Government in the realisation of the public revenues and the administration of criminal law, to a greater or less extent, throughout all the twenty provinces constituting the Government of Madras; that the aforesaid torture, although clandestine and illegal, has been for many years known to exist, and has been repeatedly denounced and condemned by the constituted authorities at home and in India, as shown by the public records.

"That this House observes, nevertheless, with great regret and disapprobation, the very inadequate punishments which have been frequently inflicted upon the

perpetrators of these atrocious crimes.

“That the House relies upon the zealous and continued exertions of all persons in authority in this country and in India to extirpate a practice disgraceful to the character of our Government and calculated to render it odious to the people of India.”

The Marquis of Clanricarde said, the whole question was one of “£ s. d.,” for the Company employed a set of vagabonds on low pay, as police; whereas, if they paid fair wages, they would obtain superior men, who would not employ torture as a means of extorting confessions.

The Earl of Ellenborough said, that during the whole of his connection with India he never had the slightest suspicion that the practice of torture existed there. Had it not been for the blue-book on torture, he should have repudiated such a charge with indignation. It was a matter of the greatest surprise and regret to him that there should have been silence on the part of those who must have been cognizant of it; and, although he did not attribute connivance to any of the civil servants, he thought they had not shown that sensitiveness on the subject of the existence of so dreadful a crime which might have been expected from the feelings of English gentlemen. He trusted that those gentlemen would be made to understand that in future British justice should be administered in a different manner. He had always been of opinion that the duties of the police and the collection of revenue ought to be separated, and that the police should be formed altogether on a military basis, as was established

with the highest success by Sir Charles Napier in Scinde. The Government officials should also pass six months in every year in travelling through the country to ascertain the real state of the people.

Lord Monteagle expressed his belief that the practice of torture was not confined alone to the Presidency of Madras, but was, more or less, universally practised throughout India.

The Earl of Harrowby followed out the line of argument taken by the Duke of Argyll, and Lord Congleton supported the views of the Earl of Albemarle. The resolutions as amended were then agreed to.

On the 18th of April the House of Commons was for some time occupied in the discussion of Indian affairs, when Sir E. Perry called attention to the increasing deficit in the revenues of India. The deficit in the year ending April, 1855, he said, exceeded 2,500,000*l.*, and he had no hesitation in saying that of the present year would be not less than upwards of 2,000,000*l.* He showed that over a large series of years the revenues of India had greatly increased, but that latterly there had been a deficit of revenue, which had been increasing from year to year. The question was, to what this unsatisfactory state of the Indian finances was to be attributed? The President of the Board of Control had said that the deficiency was chiefly owing to the expenditure upon public works; but he (Sir E. Perry) asserted that the cause was to be found in the series of wars in which the Indian Government had engaged — and which were not defensive wars — and the annexations of territory.

He read a statement of the profit and loss resulting from the annexation of Scinde, Sattara, the Punjab, Pegu, Martaban, and Nagpore, which showed a net deficiency, allowing for excess of revenue, of 288,000*l.* But this, he said, gave a very inadequate idea of the real loss, because there had been a large addition to the military charges, which had increased to the amount of 2,945,000*l.* Having stated these results, and the causes to which he ascribed them, he called attention to the policy of annexation, and entered upon a review of the administration of Lord Dalhousie, dwelling particularly upon the recent annexation of the kingdom of Oude. He insisted that the maladministration of that country was overcoloured; but if it were darker than represented, he contended that the charge of misgovernment should be laid at our own door, since it was the necessary effect of the fatal connection between that State and the Government of British India which had been commenced by Warren Hastings. The doctrine of annexation was unsound upon financial principles; but, on the higher grounds of right and justice, and the obligations of every Christian Power, that House, he said, was called upon to interfere, and, by its authority, check the system of territorial aggrandisement in India, which must tarnish the British name and weaken the foundations of British rule.

Mr. Murrough denounced in very strong terms the proceedings of the Indian Government, especially with reference to the family of the Rajah of Coorg.

Mr. V. Smith declined to enter into any detailed statement upon

these subjects at that time; the proper occasion for discussing them was when the East India Budget was before the House, Sir E. Perry having made no motion. He totally dissented from the doctrine that annexation of territory was to be considered with reference solely to pecuniary profit. If a particular annexation got rid of a state of perpetual inquietude, it was impossible to say what its value might not be. Annexation was not to be discussed in the abstract as a policy; every annexation of territory must be taken by itself, and it was unfair to judge of the result during the first four or five years. He questioned the accuracy of Sir E. Perry's figures, observing that the outlay upon public works, including works of irrigation, which he had taken at 1,200,000*l.*, was therefore, in a single item, nearly half the deficit of revenue. He admitted that the next great item arose from the annexation of territory, which would, however, ultimately realise a surplus revenue. There was another item, that of increase of charge, not only in the military expenditure, but in the allowances of civil servants, which it was very difficult to keep down in India. With regard to the annexation of Oude, he believed that, when the papers were before the House, the public, so far from being dissatisfied, would wonder that such a state of things should have been allowed to exist so long by a Power which was the paramount authority in India. In conclusion, he stated that he should have to announce, in his statement of the Indian finances, that the deficit of the last year was less than 1,900,000*l.*

Mr. Otway agreed with the

financial view of Sir E. Perry; and with respect to the policy of annexation, he asked what were to be the geographical limits of the doctrine that one State might take possession of the territory of another on the plea of misgovernment? His quarrel with the annexation of Oude, he said, was that it was in direct violation of a treaty.

Sir J. Hogg, after correcting some misapprehensions of Sir E. Perry and Mr. Otway respecting the finances of India, and observing that a desultory debate upon the subject could only mislead the House, gave an analysis of the revenues and the charges during the last six years, which would explain, he said, the reason why there was a surplus in some years and a deficit in others. In the first four of those years there was a surplus revenue, and a deficit in only the two last; but the important question was, how far the causes which had brought about this deficit were permanent, and how far temporary? He showed that the land revenue was diminished by occasional dearths, and the opium revenue by the disturbances in China. On the side of expenditure, an enormous outlay had been caused by the erection of barracks for European troops, and within the last two years a considerable sum had been expended on account of education. Upon the whole, the deficit of revenue had arisen from causes mostly temporary, while the increased charges would be reduced when the country was restored to tranquillity. On the subjects of annexation and adoption he challenged a discussion of any particular instance, denying that the abstract opinions of illustrious men

VOL. XCVIII.

cited by Sir E. Perry—some of which, he said, were mere truisms—had any application to the cases in question, many being cases of failure of heirs and lapses to the paramount Power. With regard to Oude, the only difficulty would be, he said, to defend the Government, which had the right and power to dictate, for not sooner interfering.

Mr. J. G. Phillimore also condemned the policy of annexation, as being founded upon the most flagrant disregard of justice; and the discussion thus ended.

On the 21st of July, the House of Commons having gone into Committee on the East India Company's Revenue Accounts, Mr. Vernon Smith made the annual official statement relative to the affairs of India. He said, the accounts had been produced at an earlier period than usual—on the 13th March, instead of the 18th May; but his statement was made at nearly the same period of the Session as last year.

He had before him the actual accounts of 1853-4, and the sketch estimates of 1856-7. The total revenue of 1853-4 was 19,705,080*l.*; the total charges in India and England were 21,749,197*l.*—excess of expenditure 2,044,117*l.* The estimates for 1856-7 comprised a net increase of 2,942,449*l.* in revenue, and a net increase of 2,533,852*l.* in expenditure, showing a decrease of 408,597*l.* on the deficit. The estimated deficit for 1855-6 was 2,057,633*l.*; and in 1856-7 it was 1,152,109*l.* The expenditure of money upon public works had caused the existing deficiency; and it was consolatory to know that but for such expenditure there would have been a surplus. He regretted that public

[O]

works had been so eagerly pressed forward, as a consequence of the outcry to which he himself had yielded in 1852.

The largest portion of the Indian revenue was derived from land. In the Madras Presidency it seemed desirable that there should be a survey and fresh assessment; and Lord Harris was of opinion that a reduced assessment would lead to an increase of the revenue. As regarded cotton, some successful experiments had been made; and the prejudices of the natives against the saw-gin for cleaning the cotton were giving way. On the whole, he saw nothing that should lead to despair of raising the revenue; but there was another mode of producing a surplus—a reduction of expenditure. He could not concur in the proposal to effect this by employing the native army more and the Queen's troops less; he could not think it possible to reduce the military expenditure. But there was the civil service. Admitting that it ought to be highly paid, he knew of no other service where a man of twenty could enter at 350*l.* and rise to 4500*l.* It was said that reduction would be followed by peculation: why, salaries were high enough in the worst times of Indian corruption. Let it not be supposed that anything would be done in the way of an immediate reduction of civil salaries, but the Government would keep the advantages of reduction in view.

Touching on the political position of India, he briefly referred to the Santal insurrection; which he attributed to the exactions of money-lenders and the corruption of the native collectors of the land-tax. The local officers were greatly blamed. The country had

been declared a non-regulation province, and placed under a Commissioner. Speaking of our relations with Persia, he said that it was not quite clear whether the Persians had occupied Herat. By an engagement come to in 1853, Persia had undertaken not to interfere in the affairs of Affghanistan. If that engagement were not kept—if the Persians did not retire from Herat—some means must be taken to vindicate British honour and to expel them.

Mr. Smith next described and defended the annexation of the kingdom of Oude—a step rendered necessary by the circumstances of the country, and our position of responsibility with regard to what happened in that country.

Turning from the political to the social condition of India, he stated the progress that had been made in railways. There were 350 miles of railway in operation, and 4000 miles of electric telegraph, stretching 1600 miles in one direction. The police of India was in a defective state, and Lord Canning had its amendment under consideration. Everything possible would be done to eradicate the horrible system of torture, and any person inflicting torture would be punished with the severest penalties and dismissal. He blamed Lord Harris for omitting to pass a new Act for the enforcement of the Torture Regulations. Mr. Smith gave a flourishing account of the progress of education in India, and described the interest the natives took in the subject.

Last year he had stated the result of the competitive examination for the civil service. Then 112 candidates had presented themselves, whereas this year there were only 56. Mr. Smith lament-

ed the extreme severity of the tests applied, and remarked that the double examination proposed by Mr. Macaulay, that gentleman had recommended them to relinquish. The second was an examination in law and Oriental languages; and, strange as it might sound, yet it was a fact that there were no means of procuring a sound legal education in this country. He had therefore determined to give up the second examination. He had himself introduced the *vivâ voce* system, as he thought it a better test of a man's courage, aptitude, and self-possession, than any other. He looked upon patronage as one of the noblest attributes of power. Mr. Whiteside had remarked that Irishmen were excluded from the Indian bench: Mr. Smith had presented three judgeships to Irishmen, in order that such an anomalous state of things might be rectified. It would be a proud day for England when, maintaining her rule over this distant and populous empire, she could yet say that to the utmost of her power she had advanced the physical prosperity and elevated the moral and intellectual character of the people of India — objects wholly overlooked by their ancient dynasties.

In conclusion he moved a series of resolutions relating to the accounts of India.

Sir E. Perry complained that the Court of Directors of the East India Company, though merely trustees for the Crown, assumed powers and expended money out of the revenues of India independently of the Board of Control, referring to the case of the late Mr. Dyce Sombre and to that of the Rajah of Coorg, with whom

the Court of Directors were carrying on a litigation respecting property claimed by the Rajah without the sanction of the Board. He observed that the statement of Mr. Smith was at variance with the minute of Lord Dalhousie, who had represented the finances of India to be in a more flourishing state; and he asked for an explanation of the strange discrepancy between the accounts rendered by the Indian authorities and those of the Board of Control respecting the amount expended upon public works. He dwelt upon the subject of reform in the administration of justice in India, which he considered to be one of its most pressing demands; and upon the annexation of Oude—a transaction which, in his opinion, had tarnished the honour of the English nation.

Sir J. Hogg said it was his anxious hope and wish that the question of Oude should be brought before Parliament, because he believed that the opinion would be universal that the Government of India had acted wisely and justly in that measure, the success of which had been complete, and the only difficulty would be to account for the length of time it had been deferred. He justified the proceedings of the Home Government in respect to the reports of the Law Commission, and replied to other portions of the speech of Sir E. Perry.

Mr. Headlam condemned the course which had been pursued towards the Indian Law Commission; and Mr. Lowe, on behalf of his colleagues of the Commission, did not scruple to say, if they had supposed, after the enormous labour they had undergone, the result would be sent to India

to be reported upon there, they would not have undertaken the task.

Mr. Otway went cursorily through various matters connected with Indian administration—the money expended by the Court of Directors out of the Indian revenues, the annexation of Oude, the discrepancy of the accounts relating to public works, the cases of Indian princes and chiefs claiming restitution of property wrested from them by the Indian Government, and torture, which, he contended, had been continued systematically by the Company's Government for many years.

Mr. Danby Seymour replied to Mr. Otway. He admitted that there was a discrepancy in the accounts relating to public works; but those accounts had been made up under the old system; the next year's, he said, would be more in unison. Among the promising features in the present state of India, he enumerated the impulse given to native education, the active employment of native capital, and the great improvement in the culture and manipulation of cotton. The spur given to civilisation in India would gradually cause every blot in its social condition to disappear.

Mr. I. Butt made a few remarks respecting the case of Meer Ali Moorad, and Mr. Mangles spoke in defence of the Indian Government.

Mr. V. Smith then made a short reply relative to the Indian Law Commission, after which the resolutions were agreed to, and ordered to be reported.

On the 25th of July, Mr. Disraeli, in the House of Commons, moved for a return of "the number of public Bills, and their titles, the

orders for which, in any of their stages, have been discharged during the present Session, and the date of the discharge of each of such orders."

His object was to give a review of the Parliamentary Session. This he did so fully and minutely, that a summary of his speech on the occasion leaves nothing untold respecting the results of the Session, and is its most complete history. He began by stating, that he called attention to the course of public business, not for the purpose of preferring an indictment against Ministers—the last day of the Session was not the most convenient for a party attack—but because he hoped that during the recess some remedy might be devised for the grievances he should bring under their notice. In looking for precedents for his motion, he could only find one, and that was made by himself. In 1848 he made a motion similar to the present. The House had sat for ten months, and great discontent prevailed at the slight results it had produced. It was then said that the forms of the House, that too frequent discussions, led to these results. Those were dangerous allegations. The House of Commons was a House of free and ample speech, as its name implied. The main claim of the Commons on the confidence of the country was, that in one place truth was always elicited in the long run. The Government of that day, anxious to divert from themselves the rising odium, absolutely nominated a Committee to inquire whether the forms of the House were really obstacles to the conduct of business; and that Committee decided that neither the forms of the House nor free discussion prevent-

ed the satisfactory accomplishment of public business. Now, what was the cause of the discontent that had risen within the last two months? A Minister ought not to be too prone to legislation. He should not deal with a subject unless he felt that he could deal with it satisfactorily and conclusively. It might be his only duty to ask the House to grant supplies. And although a Minister might be conscious that great subjects demanded attention, yet the country might be involved in a war or accomplishing a peace, and those might be reasons for not bringing those subjects forward. But these pleas would not avail Lord Palmerston; for he had voluntarily introduced "a greater number of questions of great importance than probably any Minister ever introduced to Parliament." He could not plead that the country was at war, because at the opening of the Session, when they were at war, Her Majesty's Speech recommended the House to attend to many subjects of internal improvement. Let him remind the House of some of the subjects brought under consideration.

"We have been asked, in the first place, to construct a high Court of Appeal, the highest court of appeal in the last instance. All will acknowledge that that is a question which may be described as the greatest of legal questions. In all countries it may be described as the greatest of legal questions; but in this country it is more than the greatest of legal questions, because it is the greatest of constitutional questions—because, in having to consider the creation and constitution of a high Court of Appeal, we have, from the nature of our institutions, not

only to fulfil that great object, but we have incidentally to consider even the very elements of a senate, or rather of an upper chamber. We have been called upon this year to consider a new law of partnership, framed upon new principles and adapted to this advanced age, which should facilitate the application of capital to commerce in the most commercial country in the world. We have been called upon to consider the whole law of divorce, and an important change in the law of marriage. We have been called upon to consider the whole discipline of the Church; the testamentary jurisdiction of the country; the police of the country; a reform of the most ancient, the most wealthy, and the most powerful municipality, intimately connected with the history and liberties of England; the superannuation of the whole civil service of the country; the criminal appropriation of trust property; the education of a whole kingdom; the retirement of Bishops from their sees; and last, but not least, the correct means of ascertaining the most important produce of the empire by a system of agricultural statistics. Why, Sir, these are not light questions. They are not only among the most grave that concern a State, but they involve the very principles upon which society itself is based."

Having given this general enumeration, Mr. Disraeli went into details as follows:—

"Sir, I do not know that I can place the legislative scheme of the Ministry more fairly before the House than by referring to the Speech from the Throne at the commencement of the Session, and reminding the House of the propositions that then, upon the high-

est sanction and authority, were submitted to our consideration. There were four measures, or, I would rather say, four series of measures, which, in the heat of war, Her Majesty recommended to our attentive consideration. The first—which was the simplest—applied to the assimilation of the mercantile law of England and of Scotland. The second was that improvement in the law of partnership, founded altogether upon new principles, and aiming at the increased application of capital to commerce, to which I have already referred. The third was a measure which was to relieve the mercantile marine of this mercantile country from charges of great weight under which it had long laboured, and against which it had long complained. The fourth series of measures, and perhaps the most important, consisted of large and extensive reforms, first in the law of Great Britain, and, next, in the law of Ireland. These, Sir, were the measures which at the commencement of the Session—in a time of war—were recommended, to use the language of the gracious Speech, to the ‘attentive consideration’ of the House of Commons. How have we dealt with these four series of measures? With respect to the first question—the assimilation of the mercantile law of England and Scotland—I cheerfully admit that the Government may be considered to have fairly redeemed their pledge. A measure to change the mercantile law of Scotland has now passed, I believe, both Houses, and a measure to change the mercantile law of England was introduced in this House. It contained, indeed, a principle of the most dangerous

kind, which aimed at terminating the necessity in commercial transactions of written contracts—(‘Hear!’);—but the practical sagacity of the House of Commons and the protest of the whole commercial community saved the country from the dangers of that unfortunate proposition. (‘Hear, hear!’) That portion of the Bill was defeated, and the measure so amended was passed. We may therefore admit that the Government, on the whole, have fairly redeemed the pledge they gave with respect to the first series of measures mentioned in the gracious Speech. How, Sir, did we proceed with regard to the improvement of the law of partnership? What were the fortunes of that great Bill which was to be founded upon new principles, which was to be adapted to this advanced and enlightened age, and which, in this peculiarly commercial country, was to facilitate the application of capital to commerce? I am bound to admit that there was every evidence of sincerity on the part of the Government with respect to this second head, for on the first day we met—the 1st of February—the important measure was introduced by the Vice-President of the Board of Trade. After discussion—after being amended and reprinted on the 25th of February—on the 10th of March that measure was abandoned. (‘Hear, hear!’) But Her Majesty’s Government determined to deal with a question which they believed to be of paramount importance, lost no time in profiting by the discussion which had taken place, and on the 7th of the ensuing month a second Bill to amend the law of partnership and to accomplish all those great objects which I have enumerated was in-

troduced by the right hon. gentleman. I find that this second Bill was introduced on the 7th of April, and on the 14th of July I find it was abandoned. ('Hear, hear!') Here we have an important subject recommended to our 'attentive consideration' in the gracious Speech from the Throne, and not only one Bill brought in and abandoned by Her Majesty's Ministers, but a second Bill on the same subject introduced, and also abandoned. That, Sir, is a very remarkable and unfortunate catastrophe for any department to experience; but I would take the liberty of reminding the House that it is not peculiar to the Vice-President of the Board of Trade, hitherto thought to be so particularly unfortunate in his legislative enterprises. (*A laugh.*) I find that the President of the Poor Law Board was not much more successful. On the 3rd of April I find that functionary introducing a Bill for the amendment of the Poor Law; and on the 23rd of May I find that measure abandoned. ('Hear, hear!') I find the same Minister, profiting equally by his experience, on the 23rd of May introducing another measure on the same subject, and on the 10th of July I find that measure also abandoned. (*A laugh.*) Here we have two Ministers introducing Bills upon subjects of the highest moment, and not only failing in their efforts to carry their measures, but recurring again to the experiment, and again encountering failure. (*Cheers.*) But, Sir, this double failure is not peculiar to the Vice-President of the Board of Trade and the President of the Poor Law Board. The Irish Government, represented, I believe, by the Chief Secretary of the Lord-

Lieutenant, introduced on the 15th of April a Bill to regulate the lunatic asylums in Ireland, and on the 21st of May I find that measure abandoned. ('Hear, hear!') But that right hon. gentleman also, not losing heart, two days afterwards introduced another Bill on the same subject, and on the 14th of July I find that second measure on the lunatic asylums of Ireland also abandoned. (*Cheers and laughter.*) I have mentioned these cases incidentally to illustrate, and in some degree to soften, the position of the Vice-President of the Board of Trade—(*a laugh*);—but the result is, that upon three subjects of great moment three Ministers try their hand at legislation, fail in their efforts, not disheartened again make the attempt, and are again self-baffled. (*Cheers.*) So much, Sir, for the law of partnership. Let us now look to the third subject mentioned in the gracious Speech. What was the fate of the great measure which was to relieve the whole mercantile marine of England from those local dues and passing tolls of which it had so long complained? Here, Sir, I am afraid I shall not find any of the colleagues of the Vice-President of the Board of Trade to be his equals in mischance. (*A laugh.*) On the 4th of February the right hon. gentleman introduced a Bill to accomplish the purposes mentioned in the Royal Speech, and on the 26th of February I find that measure abandoned. ('Hear, hear!') Well, I come now to the fourth series of measures which were referred to in the Royal Speech. The first of these related to the improvement in the law of Great Britain, and it appears, so far as I can ascertain,

that five measures were brought forward with that praiseworthy object; and when I refer to these details I think that hon. Members on both sides will agree with me, that no Ministry ever yet introduced to the notice of the House subjects of such deep interest and such extensive application. First, there was a Bill to establish a jurisdiction in the matter of Wills and Administration. That Bill was introduced on the 4th of March, and on the 10th of July it was abandoned. The next Bill was the great measure to found an appellate jurisdiction in the last instance. It was brought from the Lords on the 9th of June, and on the 10th of July it was abandoned. The third measure related to a subject of no less importance than the law of divorce, which was introduced to us on the 4th of July. Let me remind the House of the circumstances under which that Bill came down to us. After great difficulty it had passed through the House of Lords, where it had been subjected to the criticism of some of the greatest intellects of the country, and it dealt successfully with most of those great points which are the opprobrium of our law of marriage. That Bill was introduced into our House on the 4th of July, and on the 17th it was abandoned. ('Hear, hear!') The next measure of legal reform related to a subject which is a disgrace—I hesitate not to say—to this civilised and enlightened age—it dealt with the criminal appropriation of trust property. I can conceive no subject more deserving of the attention of the Government than this. The most iniquitous consequences have for a long series of years resulted from the state of the law upon this

subject; and I am bound to say that, speaking upon the highest authority—without which I should not presume to allude to the question—I believe that what is taking place in this country almost every day renders it still more necessary that a Bill of this kind should pass. ('Hear, hear!') That Bill was abandoned on the 21st of July. The next measure—the Church Discipline Bill—was not abandoned, but it was introduced into the other House, and there rejected on a division; so that none of those five important projects of law, which no one can deny deserved the deep and attentive consideration of Parliament, were passed. ('Hear, hear!') I will now allude to the measures proposed with a view to reforming the law in Ireland, in order to see whether we have been more fortunate there. Soon after Parliament met, a Bill was introduced by the Government for the reform and reconstruction of the Court of Chancery in Ireland. That measure proposed to create two Vice-Chancellors at a salary of 3500*l.* each, to be appointed by the Lord-Lieutenant; six chief clerks, at a salary of 1000*l.* a-year each; and six junior clerks, at a salary of 350*l.* each. That Bill was followed immediately by another with relation to the Courts of Bankruptcy and Insolvency in Ireland, which was introduced on the 29th of February. It constituted two judges with salaries of 2000*l.* a-year each, a chief registrar with 600*l.*, a chief clerk with 500*l.*, two assistant registrars with 400*l.*; and conferred the power of pensioning off, at the full salary of 1200*l.*, a gentleman who was once a Member of this House, and who has held his present office for a

space only of two years. The effect which these Bills produced was of a startling character. At first it was supposed that they were an ingenious means of compensating the sister country for the failure of the Tipperary Bank. (*A laugh.*) That was the popular view of the case, as it was brought before us. On the 17th of July that Bill was abandoned. But this is not a solitary case in Irish legislation. A Bill with regard to the juries of Ireland was introduced on the 5th of February, and on the 27th of June it was abandoned. Again, a Bill with respect to juvenile offenders in Ireland was introduced on the 4th of February, and on the 27th of June it was abandoned. The Bill to deal with the metropolitan police of Dublin also was introduced on the 22nd of April, and on the 1st of July it was abandoned. Thus we see that five great measures of legal reform in England and an equal number in Ireland were introduced by Her Majesty's Government, and that every one of those measures has been abandoned. ('Hear, hear!') I admit—because I wish to state the case fairly for the Government—that there were two measures passed with respect to the reform of Irish law which I think will prove to be highly beneficial; but I believe that they are both founded upon measures which were introduced by my hon. and learned friend the Member for Enniskillen (Mr. Whiteside). ('Hear, hear!') I have now gone through those four great subjects which were referred to in Her Majesty's Speech from the Throne; and I have placed before the House with, I hope, no rhetorical efforts, what has been the result of those projected measures of the

Government. But Her Majesty's Government have introduced many other measures which cannot be included in any of the categories mentioned in the Royal Speech. Let us see what has been the fate of those measures. First, there is a Bill for the superannuation of the members of the civil service, which is a very difficult question, and which has been under the consideration of the Executive for more than twenty years, and has taxed the utmost efforts of successive Chancellors of the Exchequer. I had the matter before me, and I proposed to take some steps respecting it; I know that the right hon. gentleman who was my immediate successor gave his utmost attention also to it, and that the present Chancellor of the Exchequer is a perfect master of the subject; yet so difficult is it that the Government have found themselves unable to grapple with the question. That Bill was introduced on the 15th of February. On the 18th of July it was abandoned, and thus were terminated all the hopes of that most meritorious and ill-used body of Her Majesty's servants. There is another question with which Her Majesty's Government determined to deal; and this, again, is no new question, but one which has long engaged the attention of Parliament. I mean the reform of the corporation of the city of London. That question has been before Parliament more or less for the last twenty years. There have been, if I recollect aright, two Royal Commissions to investigate the subject, and never were there more ample materials ready upon which legislation could be founded. The position of the Government with respect to that question was un-

usually favourable and advantageous, because a colleague of the noble Lord, a Secretary of State, and one of the most distinguished members of the Cabinet, had been one of the Royal Commissioners in the last investigation. Her Majesty's Government having resolved at last to settle this important question, they had the advantage of possessing in the Cabinet one who was completely master of the subject. They had, therefore, such facilities for drawing up a measure so completely adequate to the occasion, so well matured, and so perfectly adapted to the circumstances of the case, that the moment it was announced that they were about to lay a Bill in reference to the subject on the table there was a general belief in this House, in the city, and I may say in the country, that at last this great reform would take place. But what has been the result of that measure? It was introduced on the 4th of February, and on the 26th of June it was abandoned. I have here another catalogue of measures to which I must advert at the risk of wearying the House, because it is of the utmost importance that we should accurately know the *data* on which the conclusions we may arrive at must rest. A Bill for the local management of the metropolis was introduced by the President of the Board of Works. He is a man, one would suppose, who knew what he was about, and yet this Bill, which was introduced on the 28th of February, on the 9th of May was abandoned. I will now proceed to a department over which another officer—the President of the Board of Health—presides. That right hon. gentleman was originally a member of the

profession of Mars, I believe, and he was therefore not to be daunted by the failures of his colleagues. He was resolved to show a martial courage befitting his situation, and when he introduced his Bill on public health on the 26th of May, he would not abandon it. He demanded battle—and the Bill was rejected. (*A laugh.*) But I am sorry to say that after this fitful blaze of valour the courage of my right hon. and gallant friend seemed to evaporate. On the 26th of May he introduced a Burial Bill, which on the 12th of July he abandoned. He also introduced, on the 7th of March, a Vaccination Bill, which on the 10th of July was abandoned. I have referred to the efforts which were made by the President of the Poor Law Board to amend the Poor Law, but I did scant justice to the legislative enterprise of that right hon. gentleman, for I find that, besides the two efforts which I have mentioned, the right hon. gentleman introduced a Bill on no less difficult a subject than pauper removal. That Bill was introduced on the 1st of April, and on the 27th of June it was abandoned. There was a Bill of the Government which aimed to deal with a difficulty which many Administrations have had to encounter—the claims of the coalwhippers of London. That Bill was introduced on the 28th of April, and on the 4th of July it was abandoned. I will shed a tear over the fate of the Bill which was to settle the site of the National Gallery. It was introduced on the 5th of June, and on the 12th of the same month it met a fate which I deplore. It was not abandoned, but it was dealt with in a manner which did not permit us to see more of it

this session. There was a Bill introduced with respect to the Dulwich charity, which demanded legislation; it was introduced on the 17th of July, and on the 21st of July it was abandoned. The Queen's Colleges in Ireland engaged the attention of the Government; they introduced a Bill on that subject, and on the 15th of July that also was abandoned. The education of the people of Scotland had long engaged the attention of the Government, and this year they introduced a Bill which everybody thought, from the spirit of the Lord Advocate, from the uncompromising tone which seemed to animate his interesting rhetoric, was sure to be persevered with. But, no; it was introduced on the 9th of April, and on the 27th of June it was abandoned. There is another Bill before me, scarcely second to any of these in importance,—I mean the Agricultural Statistics Bill, which met the same melancholy fate. It came down from the other House; it was never brought on here, but was abandoned. Now, Sir, I ask any gentlemen in this House—I care not where they sit—whether they be votaries of Conservative progress, as we are, or whether they be disciples of Liberal movement, as hon. Members opposite I suppose are, or ought to be—is this a satisfactory state of affairs? ('Hear, hear!') I ask those hon. gentlemen who take a great part in our business, and who are habitual attenders here, whether, before this clear and accurate statement which I have laid before them, they were aware of the extent and importance of legislative failures of the present session? Not wishing to understate what the Government had done, I men-

tioned that they had passed two measures which did not come within the group of measures to which I referred at the commencement of my observations. One was with respect to the retirement of Bishops. I regret that that was a measure which did not deal with the question, and which, therefore, has settled nothing. It really is not a measure which settles the question of the retirement of Bishops. It is a private and personal arrangement, and settles only the retirement of two individuals, and though the question is one which raises considerations of the highest interest and importance, none of them are disposed of in that Bill. The County Police Bill was also passed by the Government. That was an excellent measure, and I have no wish to depreciate the merit of the Government in passing it, by reminding them that the subject is one which had long engaged their attention, and respecting which a very matured measure was introduced by the Government of Lord Aberdeen, when the noble Lord opposite was Home Secretary."

What, he asked, was the cause of this "great catastrophe," this discontent which had suddenly arisen? He believed that this failure of legislation was mainly, if not entirely, to be attributed to the fact that the Ministry could not command a parliamentary majority. He then, in order to show that there were still two great bodies of opinion in the country, made a statement of the principles of his party.

"I hold," said he, "that to be a conservative principle which regards the parliamentary settlement of 1832 as a satisfactory

settlement. I hold that to be a conservative principle which, without any blind or bigoted adherence to the doctrine on all possible occasions, believes that tampering with the suffrage is a great evil to the State. (*Ironical cheers from the Ministerial benches.*) I believe I am right in maintaining that that is a conservative principle which holds that the due influence of property in the exercise of the suffrage is salutary and beneficial. (*Ironical cheers from the same quarter.*) I think it is a conservative principle which holds that in any representative scheme the influence of landed property ought to be sensibly felt. I hold that to be a conservative principle which would maintain inviolate the union between Church and State, and which would not only preserve but expand the ecclesiastical institutions of this country. I hold that to be a conservative principle which maintains that the establishment of the Church should be respected, and that the Church itself should not be the stipendiary of the civil power. I hold that to be a conservative principle which would maintain the Established Church in Ireland—(*Ironical cheers from the Ministerial benches*)—believing that it is perfectly reconcileable with respect for the rights and privileges of all classes of Her Majesty's subjects in that kingdom. I hold that to be a conservative principle which would cherish and protect all hereditary influences, because they are opposed to a crude centralization, and because they are the source of a power at once beneficent and economical. I hold that to be a conservative principle which would respect venerable corporations—(*Laughter and ironical cheers from*

the same quarters)—and uphold a free magistracy throughout the country. The ironical cheers of the hon. gentlemen opposite convince me that I am right in this estimate, and that there is a body in this country which, though I had scarcely expected it, is even represented in this House, and which holds opinions exactly the reverse of those which I have stated. ('Hear, hear!' *from the Ministerial benches.*) The cheers from the Ministerial benches show that there is in the country, and even in this House, a body who believe that the parliamentary settlement of 1832 ought not to be maintained, seeing that it arrests the progress of a cause in the advancement of which they feel an interest—a body who believe that what we regard as the wholesome influence of property on the suffrage ought to be prevented—a body who, instead of cherishing and encouraging, would check and repress the natural influence of landed property on parliamentary representation. I have no fear of misrepresenting the opinions of hon. gentlemen opposite when I say that there are among them those who look with suspicion on the union between Church and State—who, if they bow to it, do so only because it is already established—who are not in favour of expanding, and scarcely in favour of maintaining, our ecclesiastical institutions—who would be glad to see the Church the stipendiary of the civil power—who are opposed to hereditary influence—who, instead of a free magistracy, would have a magistracy constructed upon principles which they regard as more precise and rational, but which, in our opinion, are not so favourable to

the preservation of public liberty in this country."

On foreign affairs he insisted that there was the like divergence between Liberals and Conservatives; declaring for his own party, on the three cardinal points, against the dismemberment of the Russian and Austrian empires, and in favour of the expansion of the United States. These conservative opinions, he argued, were represented in the Government. "Whether I look to subjects of internal interest, or to the great questions of foreign policy, the Government seem to me to be pursuing a course which is in harmony with conservative policy and conservative principles." It would be better that avowed Conservatives should carry out a conservative policy; but his consolation was, that if the present system continued, it must exercise a deleterious influence on the Liberal party; and he called on the Conservatives to take heart, since the Liberal party could not long exist when its chief and selected men were in power and continued to hold office not only without carrying Liberal principles into effect, but without even avowing frankly their profession.

Lord Palmerston, after some sarcastic remarks upon Mr. Disraeli's dissertation on parties, and his attempt to produce a schism among the Liberal party, observed that, while on the one hand he had reproached the Government with abandoning Liberal views, in the early part of his speech he had accused them of inundating the House with more measures than it was possible to pass. He did not admit that the public mind was impressed with a notion that there had been a defi-

ciency of legislation during the Session. When Mr. Disraeli complained of many measures introduced by the Government having failed, and inquired the cause, he answered, *Si causam quæris circumspice*; it was on account of the obstacles they met with, chiefly from the Opposition side of the House. He did not state this by way of reproach; it was attributable to a system of things from which great and inestimable benefits were derived. When measures were introduced by the Government it must not be supposed that their success depended upon their merits or demerits; they must necessarily meet with resistance, partly from prejudice, partly from want of information, and even from interested motives. This was the unavoidable consequence of free institutions and free opinions, and time was required that the measures might be well understood. The slowness of the progress of legislation was mortifying to those who brought in measures, and exposed the House to censure by ardent spirits; yet, on the whole, he thought it was an advantage to the country, because measures, however good, might fail if too hastily carried. If so many measures had failed, it was through no want of diligence on the part of that House, and, as far as concerned the Government, it should be remembered how little time was at its command. The whole amount of time available for Government Bills during the Session was only 22 days. He was not sure, he added, that if they had the choice as to some of the measures which had been alluded to, it was not better that they should stand over for more mature consideration until another

Session; observing, that upon all occasions when their policy had been called into question, the Government had been supported by large majorities. He referred to the important duties arising out of the war, and the negotiations which closed and succeeded it. He submitted that notwithstanding the ill-success which had attended many of their propositions, the Ministry had not forfeited the confidence of the House or the country.

After some observations upon a diversity of topics by Mr. M. Gibson, Mr. Napier, Mr. Mowbray, Mr. Baines, Mr. Lowe, and others, the motion was agreed to.

On the 29th of July, the Parliament was prorogued by Commission. The Royal Commissioners were, the Lord Chancellor, the Earl of Harrowby, Lord Stanley of Alderley, Lord Willoughby d'Eresby, and Lord Monteagle. The Lord Chancellor read the following Speech:—

“My Lords and Gentlemen—

“We are commanded by Her Majesty to release you from further attendance in Parliament, and at the same time to express to you her warm acknowledgments for the zeal and assiduity with which you have applied yourselves to the discharge of your public duties during the Session.

“When Her Majesty met you in Parliament at the opening of the Session, Her Majesty was engaged, in co-operation with her allies, the Emperor of the French, the King of Sardinia, and the Sultan, in an arduous war, having for its object matters of high European importance; and Her Majesty appealed to your loyalty and patriotism for the necessary means to carry on that war with

the energy and vigour essential to success. You answered nobly the appeal then made to you; and Her Majesty was enabled to prepare for the operations of the expected campaign naval and military forces worthy of the power and reputation of this country.

“Happily, it became unnecessary to apply those forces to the purposes for which they had been destined. A treaty was concluded, by which the objects for which the war had been undertaken were fully attained; and an honourable peace has saved Europe from the calamities of continued warfare.

“Her Majesty trusts that the benefits resulting from that peace will be extensive and permanent; and that, while the friendships and alliances which were cemented by common exertions during the contest will gain strength by mutual interests in peace, those asperities which inherently belong to conflict will give place to the confidence and good-will with which a faithful execution of engagements will inspire those who have learnt to respect each other as antagonists.

“Her Majesty commands us to thank you for your support in the hour of trial, and to express to you her fervent hope that the prosperity of her faithful people, which was not materially checked by the pressure of war, may continue, and be increased by the genial influence of peace.

“Her Majesty is engaged in negotiations on the subject of questions in connection with the affairs of Central America; and Her Majesty hopes that the differences which have arisen on those matters between Her Majesty's Government and that of the United States may be satisfactorily adjusted.

"We are commanded by Her Majesty to inform you, that Her Majesty desires to avail herself of this occasion to express the pleasure which it afforded her to receive during the war in which she has been engaged, numerous and honourable proofs of loyalty and public spirit from Her Majesty's Indian territories, and from those Colonial possessions which constitute so valuable and important a part of the dominions of Her Majesty's crown.

"Her Majesty has given her cordial assent to the Act for rendering more effectual the Police in counties and boroughs in England and Wales. This Act will materially add to the security of person and property, and will thus afford increased encouragement to the exertions of honest industry.

"Her Majesty rejoices to think that the Act for the improvement of the internal arrangements of the University of Cambridge will give fresh powers of usefulness to that ancient and renowned seat of learning.

"The Act for regulating Joint-Stock Companies will afford additional facilities for the advantageous employment of capital, and will thus tend to promote the development of the resources of the country; while the Acts passed relative to the mercantile laws of England and of Scotland will diminish the inconvenience which the differences of those laws occasion to Her Majesty's subjects engaged in trade.

"Her Majesty has seen with satisfaction that you have given your attention to the arrangements connected with County Courts. It is Her Majesty's anxious wish that justice should be attainable by all classes of her

subjects, with as much speed and with as little expense as may be consistent with the due investigation of the merits of causes to be tried.

"Her Majesty trusts that the Act for placing the Coast Guard under the direction of the Board of Admiralty will afford the groundwork for arrangements for providing, in time of peace, means applicable to national defence on the occurrence of any future emergency.

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons—

"We are commanded by Her Majesty to thank you for the readiness with which you have granted the Supplies for the present year.

"My Lords and Gentlemen—

"Her Majesty commands us to congratulate you on the favourable state of the revenue, and upon the thriving condition of all branches of the national industry; and she acknowledges with gratitude the loyalty of her faithful subjects, and that spirit of order and that respect for the law which prevail in every part of her dominions.

"Her Majesty commands us to express her confidence that on your return to your homes you will promote, by your influence and example, in your several districts, that continued and progressive improvement which is the vital principle of the well-being of nations; and Her Majesty fervently prays that the blessing of Almighty God may attend your steps, and prosper your doings for the welfare and happiness of her people."

The remainder of the ceremony consisted in the reading of the Royal Commission for the prorogation of Parliament, and the formal

declaration by the Lord Chancellor, in the name of the Queen, that Parliament was prorogued until Tuesday, the 7th October.

During the Parliamentary Session which thus terminated, the number of Ministerial Bills introduced into both Houses was 130; of these 95 passed into law, and the remaining 35 were either withdrawn or rejected. Several

Law Reform Bills were brought in by Sir Fitzroy Kelly, but were not proceeded with, in consequence of being superseded by Bills introduced by the Lord Chancellor, who, during the last week of the Session, laid on the table of the House of Lords nine measures for the reform of the law, which were, of course, deferred to the next Session.

CHAPTER IX.

CONCLUSION OF WAR WITH RUSSIA.—*The Russian Government disposed to Peace—Mission of Count Esterhazy to St. Petersburg—The Austrian Proposals—Circular Dispatches of the Russian Cabinet—Agreement for a Conference at Paris—Meeting of the Conference—Articles of the Treaty of Peace—Conventions respecting the Dardanelles and Bosphorus; the Naval Forces of Russia and Turkey in the Black Sea; and the Aland Islands—Discussion at the Conference on the Press of Belgium, the Occupation of Greece and Italy by Foreign Troops, and the State of Naples—Debate in the Belgian Chambers on the question raised at the Conference relative to the Press—Important Resolutions of the Conference respecting Maritime Law—Reception of these by the United States—Final Evacuation of the Crimea by the Allied Armies—Manifesto of the Emperor of Russia—His Coronation—Imperial Ukase conceding important privileges to his Subjects—Difficulties attending the Execution of the Treaty of Peace—The Questions of the Isle of Serpents and Bolgrad.*

THE war with Russia was this year brought to a close. After the fall of Sebastopol, there seemed to be too much reason to fear that a series of gigantic struggles between the hostile armies in the Crimea must take place before there could be any hope of peace. It was thought that the wounded pride of Russia might impel her to continue the conflict until by some signal success she was able to treat on more equal terms, or by irretrievable defeat was compelled to submit to such conditions as the Allied Powers chose to impose upon her. Happily, however, wiser counsels prevailed. The young Emperor, who had succeeded to the throne of the Czars, was, we believe, from the first anxious to put a stop to the murderous struggle in any mode compatible with the preservation of the na-

tional honour, and he and his advisers were willing to find in the capture of Kars such an equivalent for the loss of Sebastopol as gave to Russia the semblance of a victory to set off against the defeats in the Crimea. Besides, the attitude of Austria had become more and more threatening, and it was almost certain that if the war was prolonged, the colossal forces of that Empire would take an active part in hostilities against Russia, who had already to contend against the united arms of England, France, Turkey, and Sardinia. Nor was there any hope that Prussia would afford her real and effective aid. On the contrary, the Prussian Government showed no symptom of departing from the policy of neutrality which it had marked out for itself, and which, in a commercial point of

view, had been of extraordinary advantage to Prussia, and the King had uniformly employed all his influence to induce the Russian Cabinet to concede the pretensions which stood in the way of a pacific adjustment of the quarrel.

Influenced by such considerations as these, the Russian Government became anxious to put an end to the war, and towards the end of last year it became no secret that the good offices of Austria were being actively employed to bring about a cessation of hostilities.

Count Esterhazy was sent by the Court of Vienna to St. Petersburg in the middle of December as the bearer of the proposals for peace which would be consented to by the Allies. At the same time, the Austrian Prime Minister, Count Buol, addressed to him a dispatch, in which he communicated for the information of the Russian Cabinet the course which had been pursued by the Emperor of Austria to bring about the desired consummation of peace, and the position in which the question then stood. He said, that the Cabinets of Paris and London had been sounded on the subject, and that "although we found them imbued with the firm resolution not to lend themselves to the initiative of any overtures for peace, nevertheless, to our great satisfaction, we found such dispositions in those Cabinets as to lead us to hope that they would not refuse to examine and accept conditions of a nature to offer all the guarantees of a permanent peace, and to come to a clear solution of the question which gave rise to the war.

"Nay, more; we think ourselves authorised to express the hope that those Powers, while main-

taining in full force the right of presenting such conditions of peace as they might deem suitable, would not the less be disposed to-day not to deviate from the principle established at the commencement of the struggle not to seek any advantage to themselves, and to limit their pretensions to the sacrifices necessary to reassure Europe against the return of so deplorable a complication.

"Encouraged by these indications, the Imperial Cabinet did not shrink from the task of making itself conscientiously acquainted with the situation of the moment, and to formulate a basis upon which, in its own opinion, the edifice of a solid peace might rest. The four points already accepted by Russia appeared to us still to be the best ground to go upon. To assure the work of peace, however, and to avoid especially the reefs upon which the last conferences were shipwrecked, we deemed it indispensable to develop the four points (*principes*) in such guise as to make them conformable to the general interests of Europe, and to facilitate the final arrangement by a more precise definition."

The propositions were annexed, and the Count was informed that when these had been signed by the belligerent Powers as the preliminaries of peace, an armistice would take place, and final negotiations be entered upon.

The propositions were in substance as follows:—

I. DANUBIAN PRINCIPALITIES.

Complete abolition of the Russian protectorate. The Danubian Principalities to receive an organisation conformable to their wishes, to their wants, to their interests,

and this new organisation, to be recognised by the contracting Powers and sanctioned by the Sultan as emanating from his sovereign initiative. No State, under any pretext whatever, to interfere in the question of the internal administration of the Principalities, and no impediment to be made to their fortifying, in the interest of their safety, in such manner as they may deem advisable, their territory against foreign aggression.

In exchange for the strong places and territories occupied by the allied armies, Russia to consent to a rectification of her frontier with Turkey in Europe. The line to be definitively regulated by the general treaty, and the conceded territory to return to the Principalities and to the suzerainty of the Porte.

II. THE DANUBE.

The freedom of the Danube and of its mouths to be efficaciously assured by European institutions, in which the contracting Powers to be equally represented, except the particular positions of the lords of the soil on the banks (*des riverains*), which shall be regulated upon the principles established by the act of the Congress of Vienna as regards the navigation of rivers. Each of the contracting Powers to have the right to keep one or two small vessels stationed at the mouths of the river, to assure the execution of the regulations relative to the freedom of the Danube.

III. NEUTRALISATION OF THE BLACK SEA.

This sea to be opened to merchant vessels—closed to war navies; consequently, no naval mi-

litary arsenals to be created or maintained there. The protection of the commercial and maritime interests of all nations to be assured in the respective ports of the Black Sea by the establishment of institutions conformable to international law, and to the customs sanctioned in such matters.

IV. CHRISTIAN SUBJECTS OF THE PORTE.

The immunities of the Rayah subjects of the Porte to be religiously preserved, without infringement on the independence and dignity of the Sultan's crown.

V.

The belligerent Powers reserve to themselves the right which appertains to them of producing in a European interest special conditions over and above the four guarantees.

Before, however, these proposals were conveyed by Count Esterhazy to St. Petersburg, a step in advance was taken by the Russian Cabinet, and on the 22nd of December it announced to Europe, in a dispatch addressed to its diplomatic agents at the various Courts, the sacrifices it was prepared to make for the restoration of peace. Most probably by means of the electric telegraph due information had been given by Austria of the purport of the message with which Count Esterhazy was charged, and Russia only seemed to take the initiative in order to make it appear that the terms subsequently accepted were those which she spontaneously offered, and were not dictated to her by the Allies. In the diplomatic cir-

cular of the 22nd of December, it was stated by the Russian Cabinet that "as soon as information reached the Government of his Majesty which assured him that his enemies were disposed to take up again (*reprendre en sous-œuvre*) the negotiations of peace on the basis of the four points, such as they had been defined in the Conferences, the Imperial Cabinet did not hesitate to come forward frankly to meet those peaceful dispositions, and to seek frankly a possible solution for the third point in the order of ideas which had appeared in turn satisfactory to all parties."

The "solution" here alluded to consisted in an offer on the part of Russia to consent to an arrangement of the question of the Black Sea on the following terms:—

The principle of the closing of the Straits of the Dardanelles to be maintained. No war-flag to be admitted into the Black Sea except that of the forces which Russia and Turkey might judge it necessary to maintain there, by mutual agreement. The amount of these forces to be fixed by a direct arrangement between Russia and Turkey, without the ostensible participation of the other Powers.

On the 19th of January the Russian Cabinet issued another diplomatic circular, in which it announced its acceptance, *pure et simple*, of the propositions transmitted by the Austrian Government, stating that they only differed appreciably from those contained in the Russian dispatch of the 22nd of December, above alluded to, by the proposal for rectifying the frontier between Moldavia and Bessarabia, in exchange for the places on the Russian ter-

ritory in the actual occupation of the enemy.

The circular thus concluded:—

"By the energy of its attitude in the face of a formidable coalition, Russia has given a measure of the sacrifices which she is prepared to make to defend her honour and dignity; by this act of moderation the Imperial Government gives at the same time a new proof of its sincere desire to arrest the effusion of blood, to conclude a struggle so grievous to civilisation and humanity, and to restore to Russia and to Europe the blessings of peace.

"It has a right to expect that the opinion of all civilised nations will appreciate the act."

A meeting of the representatives of the great Powers took place at Vienna on the 1st of February, and it was then agreed that the Plenipotentiaries should assemble at Paris on the 26th of February following, on which day the Conference was opened in the French capital.

There were present—for Great Britain, the Earl of Clarendon and Lord Cowley; for Austria, Count de Buol-Schauenstein and Baron de Hübner; for France, Count Colonna Walewski and Baron de Bourqueney; for Russia, Count Orloff and Baron de Brunnow; for Sardinia, Count de Cavour and the Marquis de Villamarina; for Turkey, Aali Pasha and Mehemmed Djemil Bey.

Count Buol proposed that the presidency of the labours of the Conference should be confided to Count Walewski. "This is not only," he observed, "a custom sanctioned by precedents and recently observed at Vienna; it is at the same time an act of homage to the Sovereign whose hospitality

the representatives of Europe are at this moment enjoying."

The Plenipotentiaries unanimously agreed to this proposal, and Count Walewski accordingly assumed the presidency during the sittings of the Conference.

The first thing done was to agree respecting the preliminaries of Peace, and Count Walewski then proposed that they should proceed to the conclusion of an armistice. Its duration and nature having been discussed, the Plenipotentiaries resolved that an armistice should be concluded by the Commanders-in-Chief, which should cease absolutely on the 31st of March next, if before that period it were not renewed by common consent.

During the suspension of hostilities the troops were to retain the respective positions which they occupied, abstaining from any act of aggression.

The Plenipotentiaries further resolved that the armistice should not affect the blockades established or to be established; but the Commanders of the naval forces should receive orders to abstain, during the continuance of the armistice, from any act of hostility against the territories of the belligerents.

The sittings of the Conference lasted until the 30th of March, on which day the Treaty of Peace was definitively signed; but the ratifications were not exchanged until the 27th of April.

The following were the principal articles of the Treaty:—

"Art. 1. From the day of the exchange of the ratifications of the present Treaty, there shall be peace and friendship between the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, the Emperor of the French, the King of Sardinia, the Sultan,

on the one part, and the Emperor of Russia, on the other part; as well as between their heirs and successors, their respective dominions and subjects, in perpetuity.

"Art. 2. Peace being happily re-established, the territories conquered or occupied during the war shall be reciprocally evacuated.

"Art. 3. The Emperor of Russia engages to restore to the Sultan the town and citadel of Kars, as well as the other parts of the Ottoman territory of which the Russian troops are in possession.

"Art. 4. The Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, the Emperor of the French, the King of Sardinia, and the Sultan, engage to restore to the Emperor of Russia the towns and ports of Sebastopol, Balaklava, Kamiesch, Eupatoria, Kertch, Jenikale, Kinburn, as well as all other territories occupied by the allied troops.

"Art. 7. The Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, the Emperor of Austria, the Emperor of the French, the King of Prussia, the Emperor of Russia, and the King of Sardinia, declare the Sublime Porte admitted to participate in the advantages of the public law and system (*concert*) of Europe. Their Majesties engage, each on his part, to respect the independence and territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire; guarantee in common the strict observance of that engagement; and will, in consequence, consider any act tending to its violation as a question of general interest.

"Art. 8. If there should arise between the Sublime Porte and one or more of the other signing Powers, any misunderstanding which might endanger the maintenance of their relations, the Sublime Porte, and each of such

Powers, before having recourse to the use of force, shall afford the other Contracting Parties the opportunity of preventing such an extremity by means of their mediation.

“ Art. 9. His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, having, in his constant solicitude for the welfare of his subjects, issued a firman which, while ameliorating their condition without distinction of religion or of race, records his generous intentions towards the Christian population of his Empire, and wishing to give a further proof of his sentiments in that respect, has resolved to communicate to the Contracting Parties the said firman, emanating spontaneously from his sovereign will.

“ The Contracting Powers recognise the high value of this communication. It is clearly understood that it cannot, in any case, give to the said Powers the right to interfere, either collectively or separately, in the relations of his Majesty the Sultan with his subjects, nor in the internal administration of his Empire.

“ Art. 10. The Convention of the 13th of July, 1841, which maintains the ancient rule of the Ottoman Empire relative to the closing of the Straits of the Bosphorus and of the Dardanelles, has been revised by common consent.

“ The Act concluded for that purpose, and in conformity with that principle, between the High Contracting Parties, is and remains annexed to the present Treaty, and shall have the same force and validity as if it formed an integral part thereof.

“ Art. 11. The Black Sea is neutralised : its waters and its ports, thrown open to the mercan-

tile marine of every nation, are formally and in perpetuity interdicted to the flag of war, either of the Powers possessing its coasts, or of any other Power, with the exceptions mentioned in Articles 14 and 19 of the present Treaty.

“ Art. 12. Free from any impediment, the commerce in the ports and waters of the Black Sea shall be subject only to regulations of health, customs, and police, framed in a spirit favourable to the development of commercial transactions.

“ In order to afford to the commercial and maritime interests of every nation the security which is desired, Russia and the Sublime Porte will admit Consuls into their ports situated upon the coast of the Black Sea, in conformity with the principles of international law.

“ Art. 13. The Black Sea being neutralised according to the terms of Art. 11, the maintenance or establishment upon its coast of military-maritime arsenals becomes alike unnecessary and purposeless ; in consequence, the Emperor of Russia and the Sultan engage not to establish or to maintain upon that coast any military-maritime arsenal.

Art. 14. The Emperor of Russia and the Sultan having concluded a Convention for the purpose of settling the force and the number of light vessels, necessary for the service of their coasts, which they reserve to themselves to maintain in the Black Sea, that Convention is annexed to the present Treaty, and shall have the same force and validity as if it formed an integral part thereof. It cannot be either annulled or modified without the assent of the Powers signing the present Treaty.

“ Art. 15. The Act of the Con-

gress of Vienna having established the principles intended to regulate the navigation of rivers which separate or traverse different States, the Contracting Powers stipulate among themselves that those principles shall in future be equally applied to the Danube and its mouths. They declare that this arrangement henceforth forms a part of the public law of Europe, and take it under their guarantee.

“The navigation of the Danube cannot be subjected to any impediment or charge not expressly provided for by the stipulations contained in the following articles: in consequence, there shall not be levied any toll founded solely upon the fact of the navigation of the river, nor any duty upon the goods which may be on board of vessels. The regulations of police and of quarantine to be established for the safety of the States separated or traversed by that river, shall be so framed as to facilitate, as much as possible, the passage of vessels. With the exception of such regulations, no obstacle whatever shall be opposed to free navigation.

“Art. 17. A Commission shall be established, and shall be composed of delegates of Austria, Bavaria, the Sublime Porte, and Wurtemberg (one for each of those Powers), to whom shall be added Commissioners from the three Danubian Principalities, whose nomination shall have been approved by the Porte. This Commission, which shall be permanent: 1. Shall prepare regulations of navigation and river police; 2. Shall remove the impediments, of whatever nature they may be, which still prevent the application to the Danube of the arrangements of the Treaty of Vienna; 3. Shall order and cause to be executed the ne-

cessary works throughout the whole course of the river; and 4. Shall, after the dissolution of the European Commission, see to maintaining the mouths of the Danube and the neighbouring parts of the sea in a navigable state.

“Art. 19. In order to ensure the execution of the regulations which shall have been established by common agreement, in conformity with the principles above declared, each of the Contracting Powers shall have the right to station, at all times, two light vessels at the mouths of the Danube.

“Art. 20. In exchange for the towns, ports, and territories enumerated in Art. 4. of the present Treaty, and in order more fully to secure the freedom of the navigation of the Danube, the Emperor of Russia consents to the rectification of his frontier in Bessarabia.

“The new frontier shall begin from the Black Sea one kilometre to the east of the Lake Bournasola, shall run perpendicularly to the Akerman road, shall follow that road to the *Val de Trajan*, pass to the south of Bolgrad, ascend the course of the River Yalpuck to the Height of Saratsika, and terminate at Katamori on the Pruth. Above that point the old frontier between the two Empires shall not undergo any modification.

“Delegates of the Contracting Powers shall fix, in its details, the line of the new frontier.

“Art. 21. The territory ceded by Russia shall be annexed to the Principality of Moldavia under the suzerainty of the Sublime Porte.

“The inhabitants of that territory shall enjoy the rights and privileges secured to the Principalities; and, during the space of three years, they shall be per-

mitted to transfer their domiciles elsewhere, disposing freely of their property.

“Art. 22. The Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia shall continue to enjoy, under the suzerainty of the Porte, and under the guarantee of the Contracting Powers, the privileges and immunities of which they are in possession. No exclusive protection shall be exercised over them by any of the guaranteeing Powers. There shall be no separate right of interference in their internal affairs.

“Art. 23. The Sublime Porte engages to preserve to the said Principalities an independent and national administration, as well as full liberty of worship, of legislation, of commerce, and of navigation.

“Art. 28. The Principality of Servia shall continue to hold of the Sublime Porte, in conformity with the Imperial Hats which fix and determine its rights and immunities, placed henceforward under the collective guarantee of the Contracting Powers.

In consequence, the said Principality shall preserve its independent and national administration, as well as full liberty of worship, of legislation, of commerce, and of navigation.

“Art. 30. The Emperor of all the Russias and His Majesty the Sultan maintain, in its integrity, the state of their possessions in Asia, such as it legally existed before the rupture.

“In order to prevent all local dispute the line of frontier shall be verified, and, if necessary, rectified, without any prejudice as regards territory being sustained by either party.

“Art. 31. The territories occupied during the war by the allied

troops shall be evacuated as soon as possible after the exchange of the ratifications of the present Treaty. The periods and the means of execution shall form the object of an arrangement between the Sublime Porte and the Powers whose troops have occupied its territory.”

To the Treaty was added the following Convention respecting the Straits of the Dardanelles and of the Bosphorus:—

“Art. 1. His Majesty the Sultan, on the one part, declares, that he is firmly resolved to maintain for the future the principle invariably established as the ancient rule of his Empire, and in virtue of which it has, at all times, been prohibited for the ships of war of foreign Powers to enter the Straits of the Dardanelles and of the Bosphorus; and that, so long as the Porte is at peace, His Majesty will admit no foreign ship of war into the said Straits.

“And their Majesties the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Emperor of Austria, the Emperor of the French, the King of Prussia, the Emperor of all the Russias, and the King of Sardinia, on the other part, engage to respect this determination of the Sultan, and to conform themselves to the principle above declared.

“Art. 2. The Sultan reserves to himself, as in past times, to deliver firmans of passage for light vessels under flag of war, which shall be employed, as is usual, in the service of the Missions of Foreign Powers.

“Art. 3. The same exception applies to the light vessels under flag of war which each of the Contracting Powers is authorised to station at the mouths of the Da-

nube in order to secure the execution of the regulations relative to the liberty of that river, and the number of which is not to exceed two for each Power."

And with respect to the amount of naval forces which Russia and Turkey might respectively keep in the Black Sea, it was agreed, in a separate Convention between those two Powers as follows:—

"Art. 1. The High Contracting Parties mutually engage not to have in the Black Sea any other vessels of war than those of which the number, the force, and the dimensions are hereinafter stipulated.

"Art. 2. The High Contracting Parties reserve to themselves each to maintain in that sea six steam-vessels of fifty mètres in length at the time of floatation, of a tonnage of eight hundred tons at the maximum, and four light steam or sailing vessels of a tonnage which shall not exceed two hundred tons each."

Moreover, it was provided by another Convention, to which the Plenipotentiaries of Great Britain, France and Russia were parties, that the Aland Islands should not be fortified, and that no military or naval establishment should be maintained or created there.

Shortly before the close of the sittings of the Conference, Count Walewski said, that it was desirable that the Plenipotentiaries, before they separated, should interchange their ideas on different subjects which required to be settled, and which it might be advantageous to discuss in order to prevent fresh complications. Although specially assembled for settling the Eastern question, the Congress might reproach itself for

not having taken advantage of the circumstance which brought together the representatives of the principal Powers of Europe, to clear up certain questions, to lay down certain principles, to express intentions, in fine to make certain declarations, with the view of ensuring the future tranquillity of the world, by dispelling the clouds which were still seen looming on the political horizon, before they became menacing.

He then alluded to the abnormal state of both Greece and the Pontifical States, each in the occupation of foreign troops. With respect to Rome, he did not hesitate to declare, that not only was France ready to withdraw her troops, but that she earnestly desired to recal them so soon as that could be done without inconvenience as regarded the internal tranquillity of the country and the authority of the Pontifical Government, in the prosperity of which the French Emperor took the most lively interest.

Count Walewski next asked, whether it was not to be desired that certain Governments of the Italian Peninsula, by well-devised acts of clemency, and by rallying to themselves minds gone astray and not perverted, should put an end to a system which was directly opposed to its object, and which instead of reaching the enemies of public order, had the effect of weakening the Governments, and of furnishing partisans to popular faction. In his opinion it would render a signal service to the Government of the Two Sicilies, as well as to the cause of order in the Italian Peninsula, to enlighten that Government as to the false course in which it was engaged. He then called the attention of

the Congress to a subject which, although more particularly affecting France, was, he said, not the less of great interest for all the Powers of Europe. He considered it superfluous to state that there were everyday printed in Belgium publications the most insulting, the most hostile against France and her Government, and that revolt and assassination were openly advocated in them. He remarked that quite recently Belgian newspapers had ventured to extol the society called "*La Marianne*,"* the tendencies and object of which were known; and that all these publications were so many implements of war directed against the tranquillity of France by the enemies of social order, who, relying on the impunity which they found under the shelter of the Belgian legislation, retained the hope of eventually realising their culpable designs.

Count Walewski declared that the intention and sole desire of the Government of the Empire was to maintain the best relations with Belgium. He readily admitted that France had reason to be satisfied with the Belgian Government, and with its efforts to mitigate a state of things which it was unable to alter, its legislation not allowing it either to restrain the excesses of the press, or to take the initiative in a reform which had become absolutely indispensable. "We should regret," he added, "to be obliged ourselves to make Belgium comprehend the strict necessity for modifying a legislation which does not allow its Government to fulfil the first of international duties—that of

not assailing, or allowing to be assailed, the internal tranquillity of the neighbouring States. Representations addressed by the stronger to the less strong have too much the appearance of menace, and that is what we desire to avoid. But if the representatives of the Great Powers of Europe, viewing in the same light with ourselves this necessity, should find it useful to express their opinion in this respect, it is more than probable that the Belgian Government, relying upon all reasonable persons in Belgium, would be able to put an end to a state of things which cannot fail sooner or later to give rise to difficulties, and even real dangers, which it is the interest of Belgium to avert beforehand."

The Earl of Clarendon declared that, like France, England proposed to recal the troops which she was obliged to send to Greece so soon as she should be able to do so without inconvenience to the public tranquillity; but that it was necessary, in the first instance, to provide solid guarantees for the maintenance of a satisfactory state of things.

"We have just provided," said Lord Clarendon, "for the evacuation of the different territories occupied by foreign armies during the war; we have just taken the solemn engagement to effect the evacuation within the shortest period; how would it be possible for us not seriously to advert to occupations which took place before the war, and to abstain from devising means for putting an end to them?"

He also said that he conceived that the administration of the Roman States presented inconveniences from whence dangers

* This was a secret political society existing in France, of which the watch-word was "*Marianne*."

might arise which the Congress had the right to attempt to avert; that to neglect them would be to run the risk of labouring for the benefit of the revolution which all the Governments condemned and wished to prevent. The problem which it was a matter of urgency to solve, consisted in combining the retreat of the foreign troops with the maintenance of tranquillity; and the solution depended on the organisation of an administration which by reviving confidence would render the Government independent of foreign support; that support never succeeding in maintaining a Government to which the public sentiment was hostile, and there would result from it, in his opinion, a part which France and Austria would not wish their armies to perform. For the well-being of the Pontifical States, as also for the interest of the sovereign authority of the Pope, it would therefore, in his opinion, be advantageous to recommend the secularisation of the Government, and the organisation of an administrative system in harmony with the spirit of the age, and having for its object the happiness of the people.

As regarded the Neapolitan Government, Lord Clarendon said he was desirous of imitating the example given him by Count Walewski by passing over in silence acts which had obtained such grievous notoriety. He was of opinion that it must be admitted in principle that no Government had the right to interfere in the internal affairs of other States, but he considered there were cases in which the exception to this rule became equally a right and a duty. The Neapolitan Go-

vernment seemed to him to have conferred this right and to have imposed this duty upon Europe; and as the Governments represented in the Congress were all equally desirous to support the monarchical principle and to repel revolution, it was a duty to lift up the voice against a system which kept up revolutionary ferment among the masses instead of seeking to moderate it. "We do not wish," he said, "that peace should be disturbed, and there is no peace without justice; we ought then to make known to the King of Naples the wish of the Congress for the amelioration of his system of Government—a wish which cannot remain without effect—and require of him an amnesty in favour of the persons who have been condemned or who are imprisoned without trial for political offences."

As regarded the observations of Count Walewski on the excesses of the Belgian press, and the dangers which thence resulted for the adjoining countries, Lord Clarendon said that he and his colleague admitted their importance; but as the representatives of a country in which a free and independent press was, so to say, one of the fundamental institutions, they could not associate themselves to measures of coercion against the press of another State. While deploring the violence in which certain organs of the Belgian press indulged, he did not hesitate to declare that the authors of the execrable doctrines to which Count Walewski alluded, the men who preached assassination as the means of attaining a political object, were undeserving of the protection which guarantees to the press its liberty and its independence.

Count Orloff observed that the

powers with which he was furnished having for their sole object the restoration of peace, he did not consider himself authorised to take part in a discussion which his instructions had not provided for.

Count Buol said that he congratulated himself on seeing the Governments of France and England disposed to put an end, as speedily as possible, to the occupation of Greece. Austria wished most sincerely the prosperity of that kingdom, and was equally desirous with France that all the States of Europe should enjoy, under the protection of public law, their political independence and complete prosperity. He did not doubt that one of the essential conditions of so desirable a state of things existed in the wisdom of a legislation so combined as to prevent or repress the excesses of the press which Count Walewski, with so much reason, had blamed, when speaking of a neighbouring State, and the repression of which must be considered as an European necessity. He hoped that in all the States of the Continent where the press presented the same dangers, the Governments would be able to find in their legislation the means of restraining it within proper limits, and that they would thus be enabled to secure peace against fresh international complications.

The allusion to Belgium and threatened attack on the liberty of the press there naturally produced a considerable sensation in that country; and at the sitting of the Belgian Chambers on the 7th of May one of the Deputies, M. Orts, rose, and after a long and spirited speech, in which he asked whether any protest had been made to the Allied Powers against the accusa-

tions which had been levelled against Belgium, concluded by addressing the following questions to the Ministry:—

“Has the French Government or any Government that took part in the Paris Congress, and in the sitting of the 8th of April, asked the Belgian Government to introduce into our Constitution any reform whatsoever? And, should a request of that nature be one day put to the Cabinet—I ask for a reply at once, would it be inclined to comply with such request? These are the questions which, with a view to re-assure and justify the country, I feel it my duty to put to the Cabinet.”

M. Vilain XIV., Minister of Foreign Affairs, replied as follows:—

“Gentlemen,—I have the honour to reply, in a very few words, to the three questions put to me by the hon. Member, M. Orts. He asked me, in the first instance, whether the Cabinet had made a reply to the French Government, or to one of the Governments represented at the Paris Congress, since the publication of the protocol of the 8th of April. When I read that protocol in the newspapers I thought it my duty, though having duties of a sad nature to perform at the time, to prepare, in case either the French Government or any other Government represented at the Congress should officially forward the treaty of peace and the protocols to the Brussels Cabinet, the draught of an eventual reply which might be communicated to all the Governments forming part of the Congress. I finished that draught of reply four days since, and it is ready, and, if I were allowed to read it here, perhaps the Chamber

might find that it contains some of the considerations which M. Orts has just pointed out to our attention. All that is wanting to this document, which, as I said before, has been ready for four days, is my signature. My idea was to present it only on the morrow of the day upon which one of the Powers represented at the Congress of Paris should think fit to make an official notification of the Treaty of Paris with the protocols. Secondly, M. Orts wishes to know whether any one of the Governments represented at the Congress has asked the Belgian Government to propose any modification in the Constitution. None of them has made such a proposition. The hon. Member desires, finally, to know whether the Cabinet, in case such a request should be made, is disposed to propose to the Chamber any change in the constitution. Never!"

This speech was received with loud applause, and M. Orts rose and said,—

"I thank the Minister for the reply he has just made to my questions. After the reception that reply has met with from the Chamber I have but one sentiment to express—the pride I feel at having heard that reply from the mouth of an old Member of the National Congress."

The President then rose and said,—

"After the patriotic words of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and the sentiments expressed by M. Orts, which are those of the whole Chamber, I think I may say that the incident has terminated."

Before the Conference separated it came to some important resolutions respecting maritime law for

the future, in time of war. All the Plenipotentiaries signed a solemn declaration, which laid down the following principles:—

"1. Privateering is, and remains, abolished.

"2. The neutral flag covers enemy's goods, with the exception of contraband of war.

"3. Neutral goods, with the exception of contraband of war, are not liable to capture under enemy's flag.

"4. Blockades, in order to be binding, must be effective, that is to say, maintained by a force sufficient really to prevent access to the coast of the enemy."

These resolutions were laid before the Government of the United States by the Minister Plenipotentiary of France at Washington, but they did not meet with unqualified acceptance in that quarter. Mr. Marcy, the American Secretary of State, addressed a long note on the subject to the French Minister, in which he said that, to the second and third propositions of the Conference—namely, that the neutral flag covers enemy's goods, with the exception of contraband of war; and that neutral goods, with the exception of contraband of war, are not liable to capture under enemy's flag—the United States Government did not refuse its assent with respect to the fourth proposition about blockades; he also said that the principle was one which had always been recognised. But as regarded privateering, Mr. Marcy maintained that the right to resort to privateers was as clear as the right to use public armed ships, and was as incontestable as any other rights appertaining to belligerents. The policy had been sometimes ques-

tioned, but not the right. He said,—

“In discussing the effect of the proposed measure, the abolition of privateering, a reference to the existing condition of nations is almost unavoidable. An instance will at once present itself in regard to two nations where the commerce of each is about equal, and about equally widespread over the world. As commercial Powers there is great disparity between them. The regular navy of one vastly exceeds that of the other. In case of war between them, only an inconsiderable part of the navy of the one would be required to prevent that of the other from being used for defence or aggression, while the remainder would be devoted to the unembarrassed employment of destroying the commerce of the weaker in naval strength. The fatal consequences of this great inequality of naval force between two such belligerents would be in part remedied by the use of privateers: in that case, while either might assail the commerce of the other in every sea, they would be obliged to distribute and employ their respective navies in the work of protection. This statement only illustrates what would be the case, with some modification, in every war where there may be considerable disparity in the naval strength of the belligerents. . . .

“The President proposes to add to the first proposition in the declaration of the Congress at Paris the following words—‘And that the private property of the subjects or citizens of a belligerent on the high seas shall be exempted from seizure by public armed vessels of the other belligerent, except it be contraband.’ Thus amended, the

Government of the United States will adopt it, together with the other three principles contained in that declaration.”

The news of the conclusion of an armistice reached the Crimea on the 28th of February, and next day a meeting of the Russian and Allied Generals took place at the Traktir Bridge, to arrange the terms of the suspension of hostilities.

The final evacuation of the Crimea took place on the 12th of July, on which day General Codrington formally gave up to the Russians Sebastopol and Balaklava.

All the remaining stores and establishments having been embarked, a company of the Fiftieth Regiment was posted outside of the town of Balaklava to receive the Russian troops, and on their approach marched in with the Russian Guard, composed of about fifty mounted Cossacks and a similar number of Infantry Cossacks. The usual form of salutes took place; the Russians placed sentries where they wished; and the English troops marched on board H.M.S. *Algiers*. General Codrington embarked with his personal staff at the same time.

The conclusion of the Treaty of Peace was announced at St. Petersburg by an Imperial Manifesto, in which, as might be expected, everything was said that could flatter the pride of Russia, and make it appear that she had come out of the contest on equal terms with her antagonists. The Emperor said,—

“The enemy has been driven back from the coasts of Siberia and from those of the White Sea, as well as from the ramparts of Sweaborg; the heroic defence for

eleven months of the fortifications of the south side of Sebastopol, erected in the face of and under the fire of assailants, will be handed down as a record to the remotest posterity.

“In Asia, after the glorious victories of the two preceding campaigns, Kars was compelled to surrender with its numerous garrison, forming the whole army of Anatolia, and the *élite* of the Turkish troops sent to relieve the place were compelled to retreat. Nevertheless, by the impenetrable and wise decrees of Providence, a fact was preparing conformable to the wishes of our well-beloved august father, to our own, and to those of all Russia, and which realised the objects of the war. The future condition and the privileges of all the Christians in the East are henceforth guaranteed. The Sultan solemnly recognises them, and, consequent upon this act of justice, the Ottoman empire enters into the family of European states.

“Russians! your efforts and your sacrifices have not been in vain. A great work has been accomplished, although by other and unforeseen means, and we may now with a quiet conscience put an end to those efforts and to those sacrifices by restoring to our dear country the inestimable blessings of peace. To hasten the conclusion of the Treaty of Peace and to dispel, even for the future, the very idea of ambitious views or projects which might be attributed to us, we have consented to the adoption of certain precautionary measures destined to prevent a collision of our ships of war with those of Turkey in the Black Sea, and to the establishment of a new frontier line in the southern part

of Bessarabia, nearest to the Danube.

“The concessions are not great when put in comparison with the charges of a prolonged war, and the advantages promised to us by the tranquillity of the empire, the destinies of which it has pleased God to intrust to us. May all those advantages be obtained by our efforts, united to those of all our faithful subjects! May, with the aid of the Almighty, who has always protected Russia, its internal organisation be consolidated and perfected! May justice and clemency preside over its judgments—may the advancement of civilisation and of all useful activity spread with renewed force—and may every one enjoy in peace the fruits of his labour under the protection of laws equally just and watchful for all! Finally,—and this is the most important and most ardent of our hopes,—may the salutary light of faith, by enlightening the mind and strengthening the heart, maintain and improve more and more that social morality which is the surest pledge of order and happiness!”

The Coronation of the Emperor of Russia took place at Moscow on the 7th of September, under circumstances of extraordinary splendour, and it was attended by special representatives from all the Powers with which that country had been recently at war.

The Emperor signalised his coronation by the publication of an *ukase*, or manifesto, of a very remarkable nature. First he announced a grant of a commemorative medal to be worn by all those of his subjects in the civil or military service who had taken any part in the events of the late war.

He next thanked all classes for the zeal and devotion they had displayed in the contest; and granted special immunities to the provinces of Tauris, Cherson, Ekaterinoslaff, and Archangel, as well as to all the whole sea-coast of the Baltic, and in general to all the provinces that had more particularly borne the brunt of the late campaign.

“Furthermore,” the *ukase* proceeded, “and in order to extend as far as possible the circle of his liberality, His Majesty has been pleased to confer on the whole empire the benefits of a general boon, the importance of which can be measured only by the immensity of the sphere it embraces. The Emperor most graciously dispenses the whole of Russia from every burden of military recruiting or conscription for four consecutive years unless, (which God avert!) the necessities of war should interpose obstacles in the execution of this measure.

“In strict conformity with this same idea, the Emperor in his solicitude for the welfare of his subjects, has instructed his Minister of Finance to set on foot immediately a new census of the population of the empire, so as more equitably to assess the burden of the capitation tax, which may possibly weigh disproportionately on certain classes, whose numbers have been more or less sensibly diminished by the war and by the epidemic scourges that have raged more particularly among them.

“Furthermore, His Majesty orders, that the different arrears of taxes, altogether amounting to at least 24,000,000 silver roubles, as well as all pecuniary fines, shall be graciously remitted to the debtors. Finally, the Emperor

deigns by the same act to abolish the tax hitherto raised on passports for foreign parts, reserving only a stamp duty, to be appropriated to the benefit of the ‘Invalides.’

“His Majesty further extends his Sovereign clemency to those who have become obnoxious to public justice, and grants to all repentant criminals whose conduct has been irreproachable since their condemnation either the entire remission of their sentence or a considerable commutation of their punishment.

“With respect to State prisoners, both those who belonged to secret societies discovered in Russia at various times, and those who took part in the Polish rebellion of 1831, the Emperor ordains—that as regards some, their lot shall be considerably alleviated in the place to which they are banished; as regards others, they shall be permitted to settle in the inland provinces of the empire; and as to the rest, that they may be entirely restored to freedom, with the liberty to fix the place of their residence in any of the towns of the empire, as well as the kingdom of Poland, with the exception of the two capitals, Moscow and St. Petersburg. Finally, as the crowning point of his clemency, the Emperor deigns to grant to all these State prisoners their rights of nobility, and also to all their legitimate children born since the condemnation of their parents, whether they be already dead or still alive.”

Russian subjects of the Jewish persuasion were also relieved from the special burdens which the conscription had hitherto entailed upon them. And, finally, the

children of soldiers and sailors, who had been born during the period of their fathers' service, and who hitherto had belonged to the army, were thenceforth to be restored to their parents, and be at liberty to enter upon any station of life that they might choose for themselves.

Some difficulties arose respecting the execution of the articles of the treaty of peace concluded at Paris, which we proceed briefly to notice.

A Turkish officer was sent by the Porte with a small detachment of men to take possession of Serpents' Island, situate at the mouth of the Danube, and restore the lighthouse there which had been discontinued during the late war. The Turkish flag was hoisted, and not long afterwards a party of seven Russian marines, commanded by a lieutenant, landed also on the island, informing the Turks that their object was the restoration of the lighthouse. When the news of this reached Constantinople, Admiral Lord Lyons despatched H.M.S. *Gladiator* to Serpents' Island, and finding that the Russians declined to leave it, Captain Hillyar, of the *Gladiator*, proceeded to Odessa and demanded their removal. The Governor of Odessa communicated by telegraph with St. Petersburg, and then informed Captain Hillyar that the Russians were to remain in the island until the question of its occupation was settled by a Conference at Paris. The Russian Government, in fact, treated the island as part of the territory of Bessarabia, the cession of which was to be regulated by a Commission. In this state of things Captain Hillyar was ordered by the English Admiral to station him-

VOL. XCVIII.

self off the island and prevent, by force if necessary, all attempts which the Russians might make to increase their numbers there by landing an additional body of men. And matters remained in this position as regarded Serpents' Island until the end of the year.

Another point of dispute between Russia and the Allied Powers arose with reference to the execution of the 20th Article of the Treaty. By this, as will be seen on referring to it, the new rectified frontier of Russia was to pass "*south of Bolgrad*;" and it had been assumed at the Conference on the strength of some maps, not furnished by the Russian Plenipotentiaries but by the French Government, that the town of Bolgrad was situated at some distance from Lake Yalpukh, close to which the frontier line was to run. The Russian Plenipotentiaries had strongly insisted on the importance of not separating Bolgrad from the Bulgarian colonies, of which it was the capital, and the representatives of the other Powers, being under the impression that the situation of Bolgrad was correctly indicated on the maps before them, consented that the line should pass to the south of it, and so preserve Bolgrad to Russia. When, however, the delegates or Commissioners of the different Powers met on the spot for the purpose of marking out the new frontier, they discovered that Bolgrad, instead of being situated at some distance from Lake Yalpukh, in reality touches the northern extremity of the lake, and that the place which in the maps used by the Conference was marked as Bolgrad was, in fact, Tabak. It is difficult not to entertain a suspicion that the mistake must at the time have

[Q]

been known to the Russian Plenipotentiaries; but whether this be so or not, it is manifest that the direction to be taken by the new frontier line had been assented to on a misunderstanding, and it had never been intended that the place, whether called Bolgrad or not, which touched the northern extremity of the Yalpukh Lake, should be left in possession of Russia, but should become part of the territory added to Moldavia. It is a maxim of law, as well as a maxim of common sense, that *falsa demonstratio non nocet*, and a clear intention ought not to be defeated by an accidental misnomer applied to the thing intended. The Russian delegates, however, insisted on the letter of the treaty, that the line should pass south of Bolgrad, and proposed to take as a boundary the valley line, leaving the left shore of the lake to Russia, the right shore to Moldavia.

This was deemed inadmissible by the other Commissioners. In their opinion, access to the lake open on the left bank to Russia might enable her to form a flotilla upon the lake, the presence of which might some day be an im-

pediment to the free navigation of the Danube.

The French Commissioner, with a view to conciliate conflicting opinions, suggested a new plan—to make a high road along the shore of the lake, and thus to separate the town of Bolgrad from the shores of Lake Yalpukh, with the exception of permission to the inhabitants to have access to the borders of the lake for their daily wants.

By this combination the lake would remain Moldavian, while the town of Bolgrad, the capital of the colonies, would remain in the possession of Russia.

To this proposal the Russian delegates at once assented, but those of England, Austria, and Turkey thought it inadmissible, or at all events beyond the scope of their authority. The consequence was, that the labours of the Frontier Commission came to a stand-still, and the question, as well as that of the Isle of Serpents, was reserved for discussion at a Conference to be held at Paris, which did not take place before the close of the year.

CHAPTER X.

FRANCE.—*Opening of the French Legislative Chambers—Speech of the Emperor—Address to the Chamber by Count de Morny—Birth of an Imperial Prince—Reception of the Russian Ambassador at the Tuileries.*

SARDINIA.—*Note or Protest of the Sardinian Plenipotentiaries to the English and French Governments—Speech of the Count de Cavour in the Sardinian Chamber.*

NAPLES.—*Political Arrests and Cruelties practised by the Neapolitan Government—Remonstrances of the English and French Governments neglected—Determination of England and France to break off Diplomatic Intercourse with the Court of Naples—Communications on the subject—Withdrawal of the English and French Legations from Naples—Remonstrance of the Russian Cabinet—Attempt to assassinate the King of Naples.*

SPAIN.—*Overthrow of the Espartero Ministry—Causes which led to it—Marshal O'Donnell forms a Ministry—Spain declared subject to Martial Law—Programme of the O'Donnell Ministry—Fighting in the Streets of Madrid—Address to the Queen by the Cortes—The Cortes dissolved—Article in the Paris Moniteur—Insurrectionary Movements in the Provinces—Proclamation by the Junta at Saragossa—Submission to the O'Donnell Government—Suppression of the National Guard—Fall of the O'Donnell Cabinet—A new Ministry formed by General Narvaez.*

SWITZERLAND.—*Seizure of the Castle at Neufchâtel by the Royalists—Defeat of the Royalists—Interference by the King of Prussia—Nature of his claim as Prince of Neufchâtel—Interference of the German Confederation—Attitude of the Swiss Federal Council—Appeal to the French Emperor—Article in the Moniteur.*

FRANCE.—The Session of the French Legislative Assembly was opened on the 3rd of March by the following speech from the Emperor:—

“Messieurs les Pairs, Messieurs les Sénateurs,—The last time that I summoned you to meet, grave anxieties weighed upon us. The Allied armies were exhausting themselves in a siege, in which the stubbornness of the defenders

made success doubtful. Europe, uncertain, seemed to await the issue of the struggle before declaring herself.

“To sustain the war, I asked a loan, which, although it might appear excessive, you voted unanimously. The high price of provisions menaced the labouring classes with general discomfort, and a disturbance in the monetary system gave ground to fear the slacken-

ing of business and the diminution of employment. Well, thanks to your aid, and to the energy displayed in France and in England—thanks, above all, to the support of Providence—these dangers, if they have not entirely disappeared, are for the most part dissipated.

“A great deed of arms has since decided a desperate struggle, unparalleled in history, in favour of the Allies. The opinion of Europe from that moment has been more openly shown. In every direction our alliances have extended, or have become more firm. The third loan has been supplied without difficulty. The country has again proved to me its confidence by subscribing a sum five times larger than I required from it. It has undergone, with admirable resignation, the sufferings inseparable from dearth of provisions; sufferings which, nevertheless, have been mitigated by private charity, by the zeal of the corporations, and by the millions of francs distributed in the departments. An arrival of foreign corn has now produced a considerable fall in the price of food; the fears arising from the disappearance of gold have faded; and never has labour been more active, never have the revenues been so large. The chances of war have reawakened the military spirit of the nation. Never were there so many voluntary enlistments, nor so great an ardour among the conscripts.

“To this short statement of our situation I may add a fact of high political signification. The Queen of Great Britain, wishing to give a proof of her confidence in and esteem for our country, and to render our relations still more

intimate, came over to France. The enthusiastic reception which Her Majesty received must have proved to her how deep were the sentiments inspired by her presence, and how much of a character tending to strengthen the alliance of the two peoples.

“The King of Piedmont, who had unhesitatingly embraced our cause with that courageous ardour of which he had previously afforded proof on the field of battle, also came to France to consecrate a union already cemented by the valour of his soldiers. These Sovereigns beheld a country, some time so disturbed and fallen from her rank in the councils of Europe, now prosperous, peaceable, and respected, making war, not with the hurried delirium of passion, but with that calm which belongs to justice and all the energy of duty. They have seen France, which had sent 200,000 men across the sea, at the same time convoked at Paris all the arts of peace, as if she meant to say to Europe—‘The present war is but an episode for me, and my strength is always in great measure directed towards peaceful occupations. Let us neglect no opportunity of coming to an understanding, and do not force me to throw into the battle-field the whole resources and power of a great nation.’

“This appeal seems to have been heard; and winter, by suspending hostilities, favoured the intervention of diplomacy. Austria resolved upon a decisive step, which brought into the deliberations all the influence of the Sovereign of a vast empire. Sweden bound herself more closely to England and to France by a treaty which guaranteed the integrity of her territory. Finally,

from all the Cabinets, advice or petitions were sent to St. Petersburg. The Emperor of Russia, inheritor of a situation which he had not brought about, seemed animated by a sincere desire to put an end to the causes which had occasioned this sanguinary conflict. He accepted determinedly the propositions transmitted by Austria. The honour of arms once satisfied, to defer to the distinctly expressed wish of Europe was to do himself honour.

“At this moment the Plenipotentiaries of the belligerent and Allied Powers are met in Paris to decide on the conditions of peace. The spirit of moderation and equity which animates them all, must make us hope for a favourable result. Nevertheless, let us with dignity wait for the end of the Conferences; and let us be equally ready, if it prove necessary, to unsheath the sword again, or to offer the hand of friendship to those whom we have honourably fought.

“Whatever happen, let us busy ourselves with all matters which tend to augment the power and the wealth of France. Let us draw still closer, if that be possible, the alliance which has been formed by a common participation in glory and in sacrifices, and of which peace will make the mutual advantages appear even more conspicuous. Let us, lastly, at this moment, so solemn for the destinies of the world, put our trust in God, so that He may guide our efforts in a way the most advantageous to the interests of humanity and of civilisation.”

When the Assembly met on the following day it was addressed by its President, the Count de Morny, who said:—

“Gentlemen,—The simple and dignified account of the exalted position of France which you heard yesterday must have flattered your patriotism. Your feelings of national pride and affection for your country must have been highly gratified. In no virtue has the French nation been deficient. It has proved itself a firm and loyal ally; it has carried on the war with vigour, patience, disinterestedness, and humanity. It has been at the same time calm, industrious, hospitable, and generous. Thus has France obtained a moral triumph more valuable than that acquired by conquests, and gained for herself the sympathies and confidence of the entire world. This result, it must be admitted, is particularly attributable to the union on the throne of the two most opposite qualities—energy and moderation. Those short and glorious years which have restored France to the first rank among nations will fill an important place in history. You mainly contributed to that result, gentlemen, for you granted the Emperor an unreserved co-operation under the most critical circumstances. Let us now hope that the sound judgment and humane feelings of the eminent men charged with the negotiations will succeed in removing all the difficulties and putting an end to the evils of Europe. Nevertheless, confiding implicitly in the affection and solicitude of the Emperor for his people, and in his care for its dignity and interests, we promise him beforehand, come what will, that he may rely upon us.”

This speech was received with warm applause by the Chamber.

On the 16th of March the Empress gave birth to a son and heir

to the Imperial throne, who was christened by the names of Napoléon Eugène Louis Jean Joseph.

When Count Kisseleff, the first Russian Ambassador sent to Paris after the conclusion of the treaty of peace, presented his credentials on the 12th of November at the Court of the Tuileries, he was addressed by the French Emperor in a very conciliatory speech. "As soon as the treaty of peace," said Napoleon III., "was signed, it became my constant care, without weakening my ancient alliances, to modify by kind acts (*adoucir par de bons procédés*) all that which the strict execution of certain conditions might make severe. I learnt with pleasure that my Ambassador at St. Petersburg, animated by these sentiments, had succeeded in winning the good-will of the Emperor Alexander. The same welcome awaits you here, you may rest assured, because, independently of your own personal merits, you represent a Sovereign who so nobly knows how to impose silence on sad reminiscences, which war too often leaves behind, to think only of the advantages of a sincere peace by entertaining friendly relations."

SARDINIA.—On the 16th of April a note or protest was addressed by Count de Cavour and the Marquis de Villamarina, the Sardinian Plenipotentiaries at the Paris Conference, to the English and French Governments, in which—after stating that they had hoped that the Congress of Paris would not separate without taking into serious consideration the state of Italy, and deliberating on the means to be adopted for the re-establishment of its political equilibrium, disturbed by the occupa-

tion of a great part of the provinces of the Peninsula by foreign troops,—they said:—

"This hope has been disappointed.

"Notwithstanding the good-will of France and England—notwithstanding their well-intentioned efforts, the persistence of Austria obliged the discussions of the Congress to be strictly bounded within the sphere of the questions marked out before its meeting, and is the cause of this assembly, on which the eyes of Europe are fixed, being about to dissolve, not only without having effected the least amelioration for the ills of Italy, but without giving a ray of hope for the future to the other side of the Alps calculated to calm the minds and to make them bear the present with resignation.

"The peculiar position occupied by Austria in the Congress perhaps rendered this deplorable result inevitable. The undersigned are forced to acknowledge this. Also, without addressing the least reproach to their Allies, they believe it their duty to call their serious attention to the sad consequences that this may have for Europe, for Italy, and especially for Sardinia.

"It would be superfluous to trace here an exact picture of Italy. What has taken place in those countries is too notorious. The system of repression and violent reaction commenced in 1848 and 1849—justified in its origin, perhaps, by the revolutionary disturbances which had just been suppressed—continues without the smallest relaxation. It may even be said that, with few exceptions, it is exercised with redoubled rigour. Never were the prisons and dungeons more full of persons

condemned for political causes; never has the number of exiles been greater; never has the police been more vexatious, nor martial law more severely applied. What is taking place at Parma only proves this too clearly.

“Such means of government must necessarily keep the populations in a constant state of irritation and revolutionary ferment.

“Such has been the state of Italy for seven years. Nevertheless, the popular agitation appeared recently to be calmed. Italians, seeing one of their national princes coalesced with the great Western Powers for the support of the principles of right and justice, and for the amelioration of the fate of their co-religionaries in the East, conceived a hope that peace would not be made without some relief for their misfortunes. This hope kept them calm and resigned; but when they know the negative results of the Congress of Paris, when they learn that Austria, notwithstanding the good offices and benevolent intervention of France and England, refused all discussion—that she would not even enter into an examination of the means proper for remedying such a sad state of things—there can be no doubt that the dormant irritation will be awakened among them more violently than ever. Convinced that they have nothing to expect from diplomacy and the efforts of the Powers which take an interest in their fate, they will throw themselves with southern ardour into the ranks of the revolutionary and subversive party, and Italy will again become a hot-bed of conspiracies and tumults, which may perhaps be suppressed by redoubled rigour, but which the

least European commotion may make burst forth in the most violent manner. So sad a state of things, if it merits the attention of the Governments of France and England, equally interested in the maintenance of order and the regular development of civilisation, must naturally preoccupy the Government of the King of Sardinia in the highest degree. The awakening of revolutionary passions in all the countries surrounding Piedmont, by the effect of causes of a nature to excite the most lively popular sympathies, exposes it to dangers of excessive gravity, which may compromise that firm and moderate policy which has had such happy results for the interior, and gained it the sympathy and esteem of enlightened Europe.

“But this is not the only danger threatening Sardinia. A still greater is the consequence of the means employed by Austria to repress the revolutionary fermentation in Italy. Called by the Sovereigns of the small States of Italy who are powerless to repress the discontent of their subjects, this Power occupies militarily the greater part of the valley of the Po and of Central Italy, and makes its influence felt in an irresistible manner even in the countries where she has no soldiers. Resting on one side on Ferrara and Bologna, her troops extend themselves to Ancona, the length of the Adriatic, which has become in a manner an Austrian lake; on the other, mistress of Piacenza, which, contrary to the spirit, if not to the letter, of the treaties of Vienna, she labours to transform into a first-class fortress; she has a garrison at Parma, and makes dispositions to deploy her forces all along the Sardinian frontier,

from the Po to the summit of the Apennines.

“These permanent occupations by Austria of territories which do not belong to her, render her absolute mistress of nearly all Italy, destroy the equilibrium established by the Treaty of Vienna, and are a continual menace for Piedmont.

“Surrounded in some degree on all sides by the Austrians, seeing developed on her eastern frontier, completely open, the forces of a Power which she knows not to be animated by friendly feelings towards her, this country is held in a state of constant apprehension, which obliges her to remain armed and to take defensive measures which are excessively burdensome for her finances, already tasked by the events of 1848 and 1849 and by the war in which she has just participated.

“The facts that the undersigned have exposed suffice to make appreciated the dangers of the position in which the Government of the King of Sardinia finds itself placed. Disturbed within by the action of revolutionary passions, excited all round by a system of violent repression and by the foreign occupation, threatened by the extension of Austrian power, it may at any moment be forced by an inevitable necessity to adopt extreme measures of which it is impossible to calculate the consequences.

“The undersigned do not doubt but that such a state of things will excite the solicitude of the Governments of France and England, not only on account of the sincere friendship and real sympathy that these Powers profess for the Sovereign who alone, among all, at the moment when

their success was most uncertain, declared himself openly in their favour, but, above all, because it constitutes a real danger for Europe.

“Sardinia is the only State in Italy that has been able to raise an impassable barrier to the revolutionary spirit, and at the same time remain independent of Austria. It is the counterpoise to her invading influence.

“If Sardinia succumbed, exhausted of power, abandoned by her Allies—if she also was obliged to submit to Austrian domination, then the conquest of Italy by this Power would be achieved; and Austria, after having obtained without its costing her the least sacrifice, the immense benefit of the free navigation of the Danube and the neutralisation of the Black Sea, would acquire a preponderating influence in the West.

“This is what France and England would never wish: this they will never permit.

“Moreover, the undersigned are convinced that the Cabinets of Paris and London, taking into serious consideration the state of Italy, will decide, in concert with Sardinia, on the means for applying an efficacious remedy.”

This note was afterwards read in the Sardinian Chamber by the Count de Cavour, who, on the 7th of May, detailed there the part taken by himself and his colleagues at the Conference. He said:—“The Sardinian Plenipotentiaries directed the attention of the Western Powers to the abnormal and unfortunate condition of Italy. Had the war assumed a greater development there would have been reason to hope that the programme of the Western Powers would have been extended;

but in the present situation there was no possibility of demanding or expecting territorial changes. Diplomacy is impotent to modify the condition of nations; it can only sanction accomplished facts. The present condition of Italy, however, not being conformable to the treaties in force, the principles laid down at Vienna having been violated, and the political equilibrium destroyed, the Sardinian Plenipotentiaries invited England and France to take that state of things into serious consideration. Our Allies favourably received that demand, and took the deepest interest in the affairs of Italy. They admitted that the occupation of the Italian provinces by foreign troops was abnormal, and expressed a desire that it should cease. But an objection presented itself. It was asked what might be the consequences of the withdrawal of those troops? The Sardinian Plenipotentiaries did not hesitate to declare that, without the adoption of preservative measures, those consequences might be serious and perilous. But they thought that those dangers might be obviated, and drew up a memorial, which was addressed, in the form of a note, to the Governments of England and France. England gave her full adhesion to it. France admitted the principle, but, for particular considerations, she reserved her opinion as to its application. The Sovereign Pontiff is not only the temporal chief of a State, he is also the religious chief of the Catholic world. Hence arise for the French Government certain duties to fulfil, and if we consider the influence which an act accomplished at Rome may have on the interests of France, it will be conceived

that the French Government does not deserve from us less gratitude than the English Government. In the eyes of England the Roman question is merely political, and the English Plenipotentiary treated it with the liberty and talent becoming so important a question. I am delighted to have it in my power to proclaim here that that illustrious statesman, whom I am happy to call my friend, evinced so much sympathy for Italy, and so sanguine a desire for the improvement of her condition, that he is entitled to the gratitude not only of the Piedmontese, but also of all the Italians. The Austrian Plenipotentiary opposed a plea in bar; that is, he observed, with reason, that his Government having received no intimation on the subject, he had neither powers nor instructions to enter on the merits of the question. But he maintained the right of intervention when applied for by another Government. That doctrine, admitted by France, was opposed by England, and it was not possible to arrive at a precise solution, but we have gained a great point by inducing England and France to proclaim the expediency of putting an end to the occupation of Central Italy. The Sardinian Plenipotentiaries suggested that some of the Italian Governments might be advised to adopt a system of moderation. I will not here attempt to describe the warm manner in which the representatives of England and France supported that notion. If the diplomatists of the other nations did not concur in it, from motives of propriety, I must say that not one of them, either officially or officiously, impugned the validity of the arguments adduced

by England and France, and I am of opinion that the advice, given only by those two nations, will not be the less efficacious. The Sardinian Plenipotentiaries called the attention of the Assembly to the erection of fortifications at Piacenza, and denounced that fact as part of a system against which they considered it their duty to protest. Thus, the abnormal and unhappy condition of Italy has been exposed to Europe, not by furious and revolutionary demagogues, not by passionate journals, not by party men, but by the representatives of the first nations of Europe. The second advantage obtained consists in those Powers having declared that it was the interest of Europe that the evils of Italy should be remedied. A verdict given by England and France cannot long remain sterile. On the other hand, it is certain that the Paris negotiations did not improve our relations with Austria. I must say that the Sardinian and Austrian Plenipotentiaries, after sitting side by side for two months, and co-operating in one of the greatest political works accomplished during the last 40 years, separated—without any personal anger, it is true, for I must do justice to the perfectly courteous demeanour of the Austrian representatives—but with the intimate conviction that the political systems of the two countries are more opposed than ever. Those differences may give rise to difficulties, and create dangers, but that is the inevitable and fatal consequence of the system of liberty which Victor Emmanuel inaugurated on ascending the throne, and which you have ever since upheld. I do not think that the foreseeing those perils ought to induce the King to alter his

policy. To-day the cause of Italy has been brought before the tribunal of public opinion, whose decision, to use the noble expression of the Emperor of the French, is without appeal. The trial may be long, but I am confident that its definitive issue will be conformable to the justice of the cause."

NAPLES.—The number of political arrests which took place under the vindictive and arbitrary Government of Naples—the cruelty with which the victims were treated, and the unfairness of the trials by which the prisoners were afterwards mocked, induced the Governments of England and France this year to interfere through their Ambassadors, and endeavour to bring the King and his advisers to a better sense of humanity and justice by friendly remonstrance against the course they were pursuing. This, however, as perhaps might have been expected, had only the effect of irritating the pride of the Neapolitan Government. It was stated in an article in the *Moniteur*, the official organ of the French Government, that "the Court of Naples alone haughtily rejected the counsels of France and England, although given under the most amicable form," and that "the ungracious reception given to legitimate observations, an unjust suspicion cast upon the purity of intentions, an insulting language in reply to wholesome advice, and, finally, an obstinate refusal, no longer permitted the continuation of friendly relations."

The remonstrance of the French Government had been conveyed to the Court of Naples in the shape of a dispatch addressed on the 21st of May by Count Walewski

to Baron Bremer, the French Ambassador at that Court. In it he said—

“ The maintenance of order in the Italian Peninsula is one of the essential conditions of the stability of peace; it is therefore the interest as well as the duty of every Power not to spare any precaution or effort to prevent the renewal of agitation in that portion of Europe. On this point the Plenipotentiaries were unanimous. But how is this result to be obtained? It cannot evidently be by means the inefficiency of which is daily revealed to us by facts. Compulsion implies acts of rigour, to which it is only advisable to have recourse when imperiously commanded by urgent necessity; otherwise, instead of restoring peace and confidence, new dangers are created by providing the revolutionary propaganda with additional elements of success. It is in this respect, according to our notion, that the Government of Naples is wrong in the choice of the means for maintaining tranquillity in its States, and it appears to us urgent that it should stop in the false path upon which it has entered. We think it superfluous to point out to it the measures best suited to obtain the end which it doubtless has in view; in an amnesty wisely conceived and honestly applied, or in a reform in the administration of justice, it will find means suited to the wants which we confine ourselves to point out to it.”

To this the Neapolitan Minister, Carafa, replied in a letter addressed on the 30th of June to the Marquis Antonini, the Ambassador from the Court of the Two Sicilies at Paris, and said—

“ No Government has the right

of interfering in the internal administration of another State, especially as regards its administration of justice.

“ The measure imagined for the maintenance of peace, for the suppression and prevention of revolutionary movements, is the very one calculated to create revolutions; and, should any public disturbance take place here or in Sicily, it will precisely have been caused by such a measure; and it would provoke it by exciting to a high pitch the revolutionary feelings, not only in the States of the King, but in the whole of Italy, by this inopportune protection granted to the principal agitators.

“ The King, my master, has at all times exercised his sovereign clemency towards a great number of his guilty or misguided subjects by commuting their punishment or revoking their sentence of exile, and his benevolent heart suffers inexpressible anguish at finding that most men of this description are incorrigible, so that, if formerly our august master had it in his power to show his clemency, he is now compelled, much against his will, in the interest of the public welfare, to relinquish exercising it in consequence of the excitement produced in Italy by the ill-advised suggestions of these Governments which the enemies of order look upon as their protectors.

“ If the most perfect tranquillity prevails at the present moment in the States of the King, where revolution has always found, in the devotion of the people to their Sovereign and in the firmness of the Government, the most powerful obstacle to attempts at disorder, it is equally true that the discontented would not fail to succeed

in their audacious machinations in giving rein to the wild hopes conceived with the object of again plunging the country into disorder and consternation.

"The Government of the King, which scrupulously avoids meddling in the affairs of other States, regards itself as the sole judge of the wants of his kingdom, with a view to the maintenance of peace, which will not be disturbed if the evil-intentioned, deprived of all support, find themselves suppressed by the laws and strength of the Government; and it is in this manner only that the danger of new convulsions of a nature to compromise the peace of Italy can be averted, and that the benevolent heart of the King, our master, can find it proper and opportune to show his habitual clemency."

Similar communications took place between the British and Neapolitan Governments, and the result was, that both England and France determined to recall their legations from Naples. This decisive step was accomplished at the end of October, and a French squadron held itself in readiness at Toulon, and a British squadron at Malta prepared to appear off Naples, if the withdrawal of official protection threatened the least danger to the subjects of either France or England resident in the kingdom of the Two Sicilies.

The withdrawal of diplomatic relations because foreign Powers were dissatisfied with the internal management of its affairs by an independent kingdom was undoubtedly a strong and unusual step, and it elicited from the Russian Government a remonstrance in the shape of a circular addressed by Prince Gortschakoff to the diplomatic agents of Russia at

foreign Courts, in which he said:—

"The Powers which had coalesced against us assumed for their motto the respect of right and the independence of Governments. It is not our intention to return to an historical examination of the question as to how far the attitude of Russia endangered either of those principles. It is not our wish to raise a fruitless discussion, but to obtain the practical application of the same principles which the great Powers of Europe have proclaimed by placing themselves directly or indirectly as our adversaries; and we invoke them the more readily as they never ceased to be our own.

"As regards the kingdom of Naples, if it has not yet come to a question of cure, it appears to us much to be feared that it is high time to think of prevention. The King of Naples is the object of a pressure, not because His Majesty has transgressed any engagement imposed upon him by treaty towards foreign Courts, but because, in the exercise of his incontestable rights of sovereignty, he governs his subjects according to his fancy.

"We could understand that, as a consequence of friendly forethought, a Government should give advice to another in a benevolent spirit; that such advice might even assume the character of exhortation; but we believe that to be the furthest limit allowable. Less than ever can it now be allowed in Europe to forget that sovereigns are equal among themselves, and that it is not the extent of territory, but the sacred character of the rights of each, which regulates the relations that exist between them. To endeavour to obtain from the King of

Naples concessions as regards the internal government of his States by threats or by a menacing demonstration, is a violent usurpation of his authority, an attempt to govern in his stead; it is an open declaration of the right of the strong over the weak. . . .

“It is the Emperor’s wish to live on friendly terms with all Governments. His Majesty thinks that the best means of doing so is not to dissimulate his views upon any of the questions which are connected with European international law. The compact union (*faisceau*) of those who for many years maintained with us the principles to which Europe for more than a quarter of a century was indebted for peace, no longer exists in its former integrity.

“The will of our august Master was a stranger to this result. Circumstances have restored us to our full freedom of action. The Emperor is resolved to devote his care in preference to the welfare of his subjects, and to concentrate upon the development of the internal resources of the country an activity which will only take an external direction when the positive interests of Russia absolutely demand it.

“Russia is reproached with isolating herself, and with remaining silent in presence of facts which are not in keeping either with right or justice. Russia, it is said, ‘sulks.’ Russia does not sulk; Russia is collecting herself. (*La Russie boude, dit-on: la Russie ne boude pas; la Russie se recueille.*) . . .

“As regards the employment of our material power, the Emperor reserves this for his free consideration.”

On the 8th of December a

desperate attempt was made to assassinate the King of Naples at a review on the Campo Marzo. As the 4th division of the 3rd battalion of Chasseurs was passing before the King, who was on horseback, a soldier named Agesilao Milano darted from the ranks, and made a thrust at him with a bayonet, which grazing the King’s side struck against the holster of the saddle. The assassin slipped, and was immediately arrested. He avowed that for six years he had cherished hatred against Ferdinand II., and that it was his intention to “purge the earth of the monster.” He was tried and sentenced to death, and was hanged on the 13th of December.

SPAIN.—In the month of July an event occurred in Spain, which, although nominally only a change of Ministry, amounted, in fact, to a revolution. Unable to contend against the underhand influence of the *Camarilla* party at the Court, which, including the Queen herself, sighed for the introduction of despotic and arbitrary power in the place of constitutional government, Espartero, Duke de la Vittoria, and President of the Council, tendered his resignation on the plea of shattered health. The real facts which led to this step we believe to have been the following. For some time the tone of several of the journals at Madrid and in the provinces had been extremely violent against the Government, and disturbances had taken place in Castille and Leon, which were in part imputed to the inflammatory language of the press. The question, therefore, was discussed in the Cabinet, whether measures of restriction should not be adopted towards the

obnoxious journals. This proposal, which was made by Escosura, was opposed by Marshal O'Donnell, Count de Lucena, much to the surprise of his colleagues, who had no reason to suspect him of liberal tendencies. He however not only opposed the measure, but eventually proposed that Escosura himself should be dismissed from the Ministry. The question was put to the vote, and unanimously negatived by the rest of the Ministers. Escosura then placed his resignation in the hands of Espartero, and it was agreed that the Ministers should wait upon the Queen and hold a council, at which she would preside in person. This was done; and the Queen then decided that Escosura should leave the Cabinet, and that O'Donnell, who had also tendered his resignation, should remain. Upon this Espartero resigned his office as President of the Council, and his example was followed by the other Ministers. This happened on the 14th of July. The Queen accepted the resignations, and immediately appointed President of the Council Marshal O'Donnell, who had been the chief instrument in the intrigues which led to the downfall of the Espartero Cabinet. The Queen also, at the same time, nominated Pastor Diaz, Minister of Foreign Affairs; Pedro Bayarri, Minister of Marine; Claudio Anton de Luzuriaga, Minister of Justice; Jose Manuel Collado, Minister of Public Works and of the Colonies; Antonio de los Rios Rosas, Minister of the Interior; and Manuel Cantero, Minister of Finance. The first act of the new Ministry was to send to the Queen a formal address, calling upon her to change the system of government and declare the

whole of Spain subject to martial law.

After stating that the Ministry of the Duke de la Vittoria had been dissolved by internal dissensions, and that the nation was placed in more serious dangers than at any time during the present century, "in consequence of the fatal and complicated concurrence of innumerable causes," the document thus proceeded:—

"To the excitement of passions, the shock of interests, and the struggle of parties which accompany and follow the appearance of all political revolutions are added, Madam, since the triumph of the movement of July, 1854, the absence of systematic political and administrative legislation, the renewal and the change of all the public functionaries, the accumulation of questions of great importance, either on account of their social and religious aspect, the dynastic war recommenced in the province of Arragon, the epidemy, scarcity, and continued disturbance of public order in every part of the monarchy. In order to complete this sad picture, Madam, the late insurrections, of an eminently social character, which have afflicted the peaceable provinces in the centre of the Peninsula, have spread like a plague into other provinces on the coast and in the interior. It was in vain, Madam (and this is a sad avowal to make)—it was in vain that the Constituent Cortes, in their intelligent foresight, and the Cabinet which have retired, with zeal and patriotism endeavoured to check the increase and spread of these evils and these disorders. Neither the presence, the authority, the co-operation of the Parliament, nor the use of the power which, to the

last moment of its existence, remained with the late Ministry, nor the state of siege maintained or established on the great territorial zones, nor the action of military justice applied by the imperious law of necessity, have been able hitherto to re-establish political and social discipline, preserve public peace, and consolidate material order for any length of time.

“ This crisis, Madam, evidently demands a change of system in the government of the State; it requires a policy of union and conciliation between all men and towards all the parties which exist in the constitutional monarchy; it calls for a just and efficient repression of all the elements which agitate in the depths or work on the surface of society; it requires, in short, Madam, the concentration and the firm unity of the public power, exercising simultaneously its action on all parties with prudence, but with vigour, in order that that action might restore its lost spring to the principle of authority, to the laws their respect, to the citizens the guarantee of their most sacred rights, to the people moral order, and to the monarchy internal peace.

“ It was in no other manner that, under circumstances incomparably less imperious and difficult, it was possible, Madam, both in Spain and abroad, to save society from dissolution, and nationalities from ruin.

“ The Government, Madam, encourages the firm hope that, thanks to the means which it proposes to your Majesty, and to others which it has not now pointed out, owing to the haste in which it submits this statement to the high consideration of your Majesty, it will be able promptly to attain the

object to which its exertions tend, and in which are summed up the most sacred, the most imperious, and the most vital of the duties of a constituted power.

“ When it shall have attained it with the invincible support of public opinion, energetically pronounced in its favour, it will hasten to fulfil another duty not less imperious—that of re-establishing normal order and submitting its conduct to the judgment of the Cortes, religiously practising in the administration of the State and in its relations with the Parliament the principles of respect for the law and love of liberty which have been the objects of the worship of your present advisers during their whole existence.”

It then proposed for the approbation of the Queen the following decree, which was immediately adopted and signed by her, being countersigned also by the Minister of the Interior.

“ Considering the extraordinary circumstances in which the monarchy is placed, and in conformity with what has been proposed to me by my Council of Ministers, I decree as follows:—

“ Art. 1. All the provinces of the Peninsula and the adjacent islands are declared in a state of siege.

“ Art. 2. The Captains-General of Provinces will resume, and exercise during the state of siege, the extraordinary powers which in such a state are attributed to them by the general regulations of the army, and the laws and provisions, in vigour.

“ Art. 3. The Government will render an account to the Cortes of the use and application of those extraordinary powers.”

But the people did not submit

to the overthrow of liberty without a struggle. A contest arose in the streets of Madrid on the following day (the 15th of July) between the National Guards and the troops of the line. The National Guards, however, soon abandoned the struggle, which was continued by a portion of the populace under the guidance of a celebrated *torreador*, or bull-fighter, named Pucheta, who intrenched himself and his followers behind barricades in the Plaza Mayor. Upon this position the troops next day opened a destructive fire of cannon and musketry, and towards evening made themselves masters of the ground. The chief, Pucheta, and a great many of his supporters were killed in the conflict, and further resistance was entirely at an end. Indeed, so effectually was it suppressed, that on the following day the state of siege in which Madrid had been declared was removed by proclamation, and the city resumed its usual aspect.

In the meantime the Cortes, which had not been formally prorogued, or so many of its members as happened then to be in Madrid, met together, and out of 93 members assembled, 81 to 1 voted that they had no confidence in the O'Donnell Ministry. The other deputies did not vote at all. The following Address to the Queen was then agreed to:—

“Madam, — The Constituent Cortes have decided in this day's sitting, after having seen in the supplement to the *Gazette* what the first acts of the new Ministry were, that that Cabinet has not the confidence of the Chamber, and they inform your Majesty of that fact, being well persuaded that your Majesty, in your anxiety for

the peace and prosperity of this nation, will use your Royal prerogative to conjure away the great evils which the Constituent Cortes apprehend for the liberty of the people and for the throne, which your Majesty fills so nobly.”

A Committee was appointed to carry this Address to the Palace, but on their way the members were fired upon and prevented from entering.

A Royal decree next appeared, declaring the sittings of the Constituent Cortes to be definitively closed, and their mission terminated.

Shortly after these events had occurred at Madrid, a somewhat remarkable article appeared in the Paris *Moniteur*, the official organ of the French Government, in which a significant approval was given to the acts of O'Donnell, by which constitutional liberty was overthrown in Spain. As it doubtless exhibits the sentiments of the French Emperor on the subject, we think it possesses sufficient importance to be quoted at length:—

“We have watched with interest the recent events in Spain, and we have approved them to a certain extent, as we fancied we discovered therein a favourable chance for establishing the constitutional government on a firm basis; for France, which represents in Europe the ideas of 1789, can entertain no other wish than that of beholding a neighbouring State, in whose prosperity she takes a deep interest, avoid anarchy or despotism—those two shoals so dangerous to progress and liberty; and, as the Espartero Ministry did not seem to possess either the power to prevent excesses or the requisite energy to lead a great country, it is natural to hail with sympathy

a change of a nature to consolidate the throne of Isabella II.

“Some foreign journals, blinded by their unwarranted preference for a name, have called a *coup d'état* that which was simply a resignation of Ministers, accepted purely and simply by the Queen after reiterated refusals. If the resignation had been that of O'Donnell they would have found it perfectly constitutional. Party spirit should never misrepresent things to such an extent, and thereby endeavour to mislead public opinion.

“The condition of Spain had been deplorable for two years; that great country, for so long a time the arbiter of Europe, whose alliance but recently was eagerly sought for, had sunk into insignificance. It had neither finances, nor army, nor commerce, nor administration, nor influence abroad. In this difficult position ambitious men, instead of endeavouring to give strength to what existed, attempted to overthrow it, either by flattering the passions of the mob or by attempting to realise dangerous utopias. The disorders which have agitated Spain for the last few years must be attributed to the fatal idea of certain Ministers, for years since, to make a *coup d'état*, when Spain was tranquil and prosperous, and when there was no cogent reason to urge them to make a sudden change in the laws of the kingdom.

“For a *coup d'état* to be legitimate in the eyes of posterity it must be justified by a supreme necessity, and be regarded by all men as the sole means of saving the country.

“We know those who dreamt of *coups d'état*, not with a view to modify some institutions, but to

subvert the throne or change the dynasty, either by uniting Portugal to Spain under the House of Braganza or by establishing a regency. We therefore give credit (*nous lui savons gré*) to Marshal O'Donnell for having attempted, *without a coup d'état*, to restore order in Spain, the first and indispensable basis of liberty. We give him due credit for having during the first moment of anarchy devoted all his care to the reform of the Spanish army, as well in a moral as in a material point of view; for it did not suffice to reform battalions and squadrons—it was essentially necessary to give to soldiers who are as brave as they are capable of great things the only mainsprings for the maintenance of an army—duty and fidelity to the Sovereign, and discipline.

“Let us hope, then, that the recent changes will put an end to those *coups d'état* and to those baneful *pronunciamientos*, for it is our sincere desire that Spain, which contains so many elements of strength and prosperity, should resume, in the midst of quiet, the rank which is her due, instead of descending to the level of certain Republics of South America, where neither patriotism, nor civic virtues, nor high principle are to be found, but only a few Generals, who dispute the power with the help of soldiers led astray by empty promises.”

The example of resistance set by the capital was simultaneously followed in several of the provinces, especially in Arragon; and a Junta was formed at Saragossa by the local authorities, with the Captain-General as President. On the 16th they issued the following proclamation to the Spanish nation:—

[R]

“ A political movement, of which history affords but few instances, has taken place in our city. Without any display of power, without military precautions, without the least disturbance, or the people uttering a single alarming cry, all the authorities, the Deputies in the Cortes, the popular corporations, and the chiefs of the army and the National Militia, interpreting the will of Madrid, Saragossa, and the entire country, resolved yesterday to resist the Administration of General O'Donnell, who has trodden all principles under foot, revolted against the Constituent Cortes, and violated his own solemn engagements. If the condemned authority of the Cortes is to be re-established to its full extent—if the Throne is to remain closely united with the people—if the political principle represented by the Duke of Victory is to remain unimpaired,—the nation will have to undergo new sacrifices, in order to preserve those conquests of the revolution of July, now placed in extreme danger. The offer made by the whole country to the Duke of Victory must now be realised. Those who in prosperous days promised him two years ago their full and loyal support are bound to come forward at a moment when he is the victim of a political intrigue likely to entail on us a long series of misfortunes. We do not wish to innovate; we desire neither more nor less than the results of the revolution of July, 1854. The Throne, the Cortes, progress (of which General Espartero has ever been the personification), public order, and material prosperity—such are our principles and those professed by the entire Liberal party. Those principles having been violated by

the Count de Lucena, it behoves us to make an effort, the more efficacious as it will be general, in favour of menaced liberty, of the Cortes, who have been treated with scorn, and of the Throne, now divorced from the country.”

The movement, however, in the provinces came to nothing. One by one the towns submitted to the new Government, and on the 1st of August the Queen's troops, under General Dulce, entered Saragossa without resistance.

One of the next steps of the O'Donnell Ministry, in imitation of what had happened in France after the *coup d'état* of December, 1851, was the abolition of the National Guard. A Royal decree to that effect appeared in the *Gazette* of the 15th of August, preceded by a very long document, signed by all the Ministers, in which the reasons for this measure were fully detailed. And it is impossible to deny that these reasons contained a good deal of truth.

“ If,” they said, “ we except the period of the last civil war, during which the militia of the provinces afflicted by that cruel scourge gave signal proofs of valour and constancy, and sealed with its noble blood the loyalty of its patriotic sentiments in favour of a cause which was the symbol of the double legitimacy of the dynasty and of the constitutional system, it must be admitted that, on the whole, the National Guard was an element of unceasing perturbation, a constant opponent of every established Government, and that, whatever may have been the origin or spirit of that opposition, it ever had the effect of preventing all salutary reforms. It is so true that the spirit of disobedience resides in the very heart of this in-

stitution, that even during the Seven Years' War, when the throne of your Majesty and the national liberties were the object of a sanguinary struggle—when the close and sincere union of all their legitimate defenders constituted one of the conditions of the desired triumph, the National Guard participated in revolutionary movements which more than once compromised the success of the struggle. When victory was at last secured,—when the fears inspired by the common enemy had vanished, the National Guard gave free scope to the passions which fermented in its bosom, and crowned a series of acts of perturbation by actively co-operating in the general commotion of 1840. Obeying the inexorable law of its destiny, and driven to insanity by an irresistible call, the militia revolted and itself destroyed the work of its own hands, and raised on the slippery basis of its bayonets that uninterrupted succession of identical phenomena.

. . . . Past experience is there to demonstrate that the National Guard must be proclaimed incompatible with the normal and regular Government of the State.

. . . . The National Guard, placed between the protecting forces and the subversive forces of society, by arresting the energetic impulse of the first efficaciously contributed to the triumph of the latter, and, unless the rapid course of events obliged it to disclose its occult designs, it was always the tutelar ægis under the protection of which the eternal enemies of peace and happiness of nations conspired and executed in Spain their criminal projects. . . .

If the National Guard be a constant cause of perturbation to

public order and tranquillity, if it be an object of disgust and uneasiness to the commercial classes, and a corrupting venom to the indigent and proletarian classes, if it be prejudicial to production, if it intimidates and paralyzes trade, arrests and prevents peaceable reforms, if it be hostile to all power and Government, if it impede the free development of representative institutions, if it leads astray and capriciously directs public opinion, if it be not susceptible of a reasonable organisation, with a legal and definite destination, if it be averse to the present system, which has for its object the union, instead of the disunion, of the high powers of the State, and, finally, if when great catastrophes are imminent the National Guard stand impassive in the common wreck of order and liberty, the Ministers who sign the present exposition, after vindicating and legitimatizing their conduct in the eyes of the nation and of posterity, tranquilly await the verdict of their fellow-citizens, and, conscious of the services they render the Constitutional Throne of your Majesty, they have the honour to propose to your Majesty the adoption of the annexed project of law."

The Queen accordingly decreed:—

"Art. 1. The National Guard of the kingdom is dissolved and definitively depressed.

"Art. 2. The Government will account to the Cortes, at their next session, for the adoption of this measure."

O'Donnell did not long continue to hold the reins of power which he had so unscrupulously grasped. It seems to be the fate of Spain—fallen and degraded in the scale of

nations, never to know the blessings of a settled and permanent Government; and the people there are mocked by a succession of ephemeral Ministries, the offspring too often of cabals and intrigues in which they have no interest, and which represent Court influence much more than public opinion—if public opinion can be said to exist in Spain.

On the 13th of October, the O'Donnell Ministry having resigned, a new Cabinet was formed, consisting of the following members:—

General Narvaez, President of the Council.

M. Pidal, Foreign Affairs.

M. Seijas Lozano, Finances.

M. Nocedal, Interior.

M. Arrazola, Justice.

General Lersundi, Marine.

M. Pidal had been Minister of the Interior in 1845—6, and General Lersundi, Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Bravo Murillo Cabinet. MM. Seijas Lozano and Arrazola had also previously filled offices in former Ministries. They were advocates by profession, as also were MM. Pidal and Nocedal, so that four of the new Ministers were members of the Spanish bar.

SWITZERLAND. — On the morning of the 2nd of September, a band of men, calling themselves Royalists, and headed by the Count de Pourtales, suddenly attacked and seized possession of the Castle at Neufchâtel, which was the seat of the Government of the Canton. They issued proclamations announcing that the blow was struck on behalf of the King of Prussia, and calling on the inhabitants to rally round them and support the authority of

the King. When the news of this event reached the Swiss Federal Council they immediately ordered some battalions of Federal troops to march on Neufchâtel, and on the 4th of September, after a sharp struggle, the Royalist party was completely defeated, and the Republican flag was hoisted on the walls of the castle. 12 of the Royalists were killed, and upwards of 100 were taken prisoners.

This event would not be worth mentioning were it not for the attitude assumed by the King of Prussia in consequence of what had happened. The Federal Council decided that the prisoners should be tried for high treason in the Federal Courts. The King of Prussia, however, demanded that they should be unconditionally liberated, and based his claim to interpose on their behalf upon the rights he possessed as Prince of Neufchâtel, which originated in the early part of the last century.

The Principality of Neufchâtel, after many changes of ownership, became vested in the old French family of Longueville, and when this became extinct by the death of Maria, Duchess of Orleans, in 1707, the States of Neufchâtel transferred their allegiance to the House of Brandenburg, as heirs of the House of Orange, which, in ancient times, were lords of the Principality. The feudal relation of the King of Prussia to the Neufchâtelois, as Prince of Neufchâtel, continued until 1806, when France overran Switzerland, and Napoleon conferred the Principality on Marshal Berthier, who assumed the title of Prince of Neufchâtel-Wagram. In 1814, however, after the fall of Napoleon, it was restored to Prussia, and the States did homage to the King in July of

that year, who bestowed on the Principality a constitutional charter, which became the basis of its government in future. On the 12th of September, 1814, Neuchâtel was admitted a member of the Swiss Confederation (being the only Canton which was not Republican in its constitution), but at the Congress of Vienna, in 1815, the sovereign rights of the King of Prussia over the Canton were fully recognised and confirmed.

Between that period and 1848 nothing occurred to bring his titular appellation as Prince of Neuchâtel into question, or subject to jealous scrutiny whatever rights he claimed by virtue of it. But in 1848 Neuchâtel determined to identify itself more closely with the Swiss Confederation, and a constitution was framed assimilating its institutions to those of the other Cantons. The claim of the Prussian King to any seigniorial rights over Neuchâtel was now disputed, and this led to discussions and protests which continued down to 1852, when, at a Conference of the representatives of the five Great Powers, Great Britain, France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia at London, the suzerainty of the King of Prussia was recognised, and a formal protocol to that effect was drawn up on the 24th of May in that year. In this state matters continued until the outbreak of the Royalist movement at Neuchâtel in the present year.

On the 18th of November, the Prussian Minister, M. de Sydow, made the following verbal communication to the President of the Confederation:—

“The King (of Prussia) demands the preliminary and uncon-

ditional liberation of the prisoners at Neuchâtel, implying every guarantee for their persons and property; as soon as these conditions are complied with, the King declares himself willing to enter into negotiations. He has the more confidence that his request will be granted as in not having asserted his rights since 1848 he has given proofs of the greatest moderation. Should it not be complied with, the King reserves to himself to take such ulterior measures as he may deem advisable.”

The representatives of the States of the German Confederation—Austria, Bavaria, and Baden—accredited to the Swiss Confederation, supported, in the name of the German Diet, the demand of Prussia, but at the same time stated that their Governments entertained feelings of friendship and good neighbourhood towards Switzerland.

The Federal Council, however, to which these overtures were communicated by the President, unanimously resolved to make the following reply to Prussia:—

“It cannot accede to the immediate and unconditional liberation of the prisoners. With a view to an amicable settlement of the conflict relative to Neuchâtel, it is nevertheless disposed, on its part, to enter into negotiations.”

This reply was communicated verbally to M. de Sydow by the President, and also in the same manner to the representatives of Austria, Bavaria, and Baden; but previously the Federal Council sent General Dufour on a special mission to the Emperor of the French. General Dufour was charged to instruct the Emperor upon the state of the question,

and the causes which induced the Federal Council to decline granting an unconditional pardon.

In making public these proceedings by communications to the Swiss journals, the Federal Council said :—

“It is worthy of observation that the Federal Council has always been unanimous in its deliberations on the Neufchâtel question.

“Its invariable aim is to protect the independence of Neufchâtel, and to obtain the recognition thereof by all the Powers.”

The King of Prussia, however, seemed to be equally confident in the justice of his claim, and at the opening of the Session of the Chambers on the 29th of November, he thus alluded in his speech to the Neufchâtel question :—

“I have been most painfully affected by the recent events in my Principality of Neufchâtel, where the antagonism that has existed ever since 1848 between my undoubted right and the actual movement of public affairs has brought loyal men into the power of their adversaries. The moderation with which, in the interest of the general peace, I have treated the existing state of things in this Principality for years past has been duly appreciated and recognised by the Powers of Europe. It is my wish, even after this last deplorable conflict, and now that my indisputable right has been recently corroborated by the unanimous resolution of the German Federal Diet, to bring about a settlement in harmony with the dignity of my crown by means of negotiations with the European Powers ; at the same time I must not, and will not, allow my long-enduring patience to be turned

into a weapon against my rights. My people may rest convinced that I shall make the serious and thorough consideration of my own duties and of the state of things in Europe the guide and criterion of my further steps in this matter, and I entertain, too, the confident trust that, whenever circumstances may call for it, my people will step forward to vindicate the honour of my Crown with the same energy, loyalty, and devotion they have ever shown.”

The French Emperor advised the Federal Council to release the political prisoners as a preliminary step to further negotiation ; but this they refused to do, and their refusal seems to have irritated the Emperor : for an article appeared in the *Moniteur* which plainly intimated that Switzerland might have to encounter the enmity of France if the Neufchâtel Government persisted in bringing the Royalists to trial. “The attitude of the Government of France,” said the *Moniteur*, “from her geographical position, must necessarily have a marked influence upon the settlement of this difference. Consequently it was the interest of both parties not to neglect anything to make sure of its support.

“The King of Prussia addressed himself to the Emperor, expressing to him, in emphatic language, all the interest he felt for men compromised in his cause. He begged His Majesty to request their liberation, communicating to him at the same time his conciliating dispositions.

“The French Government, happy to be able to prevent a conflict between two Powers to which it is bound by friendly intercourse, hastened to comply with the re-

quest of King Frederick William, and, strong in its good intentions towards Switzerland, and with the knowledge of the conciliating sentiments of Prussia, it requested the liberation of the prisoners.

“At the same time the Government of the Emperor did not conceal the happy results which that concession might have, as it would become a sort of obligation on the part of France to prevent any armed conflict, and to exert itself to obtain from the King of Prussia a final settlement of the question conformable to the wishes of Switzerland.

“Unhappily, these wise considerations have not been appreciated; the counsels of France have been rejected, and the Federal Government has preferred to yield to democratical influences which are agitated around it, rather than to comply with well-meant counsels inspired solely by the desire of effecting an amicable settlement of a question which, pending too long already, might, if more complicated, disturb the peace of Europe.

“Thus France has met, on the

one hand, with moderation, the sincere desire of terminating a delicate question, and a courteous deference for her political situation; on the other hand, on the contrary, a lamentable obstinacy, an exaggerated susceptibility, and a complete indifference to her counsels.

“Switzerland must not therefore be astonished if, in the course of events, she should no longer find that goodwill which she might so easily have obtained at the cost of a very slight sacrifice.”

Afterwards, the tone of the King of Prussia became more and more warlike, and it seemed as if Europe were about to witness a bloody struggle between the armies of Prussia and Switzerland to determine the exact nature of the shadowy claims put forward by the House of Brandenburg to interfere in the internal affairs of one of the Swiss Cantons. Happily, however, no overt act of hostility took place this year, and we may confidently hope that the dispute will be amicably adjusted by negotiation and compromise.

CHAPTER XI.

INDIA.—*Arrival of Viscount Canning, the new Governor-General of India—Proclamation of the Governor-General in Council announcing the Annexation of Oude.*

WAR WITH PERSIA.—*Brief account of Herat—Convention between Great Britain and Persia in 1853—Causes which led to the war with Persia—Proclamation of the Governor-General in Council—Arrival of the Expeditionary Force in the Persian Gulf—Attack and Defeat of the Persian Troops at Reshire—Bombardment of Bushire—Its Surrender—Prospects of the Expedition.*

HOSTILITIES IN CHINA.—*Articles of the Chinese Supplementary Treaty of 1843—Colonial Ordinance passed by the Legislative Council of Hong Kong—Question of the right to grant registers to vessels—Seizure by Chinese officers of the crew of the Arrow—Remonstrance addressed to Commissioner Yeh—Correspondence on the subject—Capture by the English of the Dutch Folly Fort—Unsuccessful negotiations—Demand by the British Plenipotentiary, Sir John Bowring, of access to the interior of Canton—Origin of this claim—Bombardment of Canton—The British troops enter the city, and are subsequently withdrawn—Destruction of Chinese War Junks—Capture of the French Folly and Bogue Forts—The Foreign Factories at Canton burnt by the Chinese.*

INDIA. The Marquis of Dalhousie having resigned last year the office of Governor-General of India, which he had filled for upwards of eight years with marked ability and success, Viscount Canning was appointed to succeed him, and on the 29th of February he arrived at Calcutta.

Shortly before, on the 7th of February, it was announced by an official proclamation of the Governor-General in Council, that the kingdom of Oude, the internal administration and finances of which had long been in a state of hopeless confusion, was annexed to the territories of the East Indies. The reasons which induced the Indian

Government to take this step are fully detailed in the proclamation, which we subjoin:—

“By a treaty concluded in the year 1801, the Honourable East India Company engaged to protect the Sovereign of Oude against every foreign and domestic enemy, while the Sovereign of Oude, upon his part, bound himself to establish ‘such a system of administration, to be carried into effect by his own officers, as should be conducive to the prosperity of his subjects, and calculated to secure the lives and properties of the inhabitants.’

“The obligations which the treaty imposed upon the Honourable East India Company have

been observed by it, for more than half a century, faithfully, constantly, and completely.

“ In all that time, though the British Government itself has been engaged in frequent wars, no foreign foe has ever set his foot on the soil of Oude ; no rebellion has ever threatened the stability of its throne. British troops have been stationed in close proximity to the King’s person ; and their aid has never been withheld whenever his power was wrongfully defied.

“ On the other hand, one chief and vital stipulation of the treaty has been wholly disregarded by every successive ruler of Oude ; and the pledge, which was given for the establishment of such a system of administration as should secure the lives and properties of the people of Oude, and be conducive to their prosperity, has from first to last been deliberately and systematically violated.

“ By reason of this violation of the compact made, the British Government might long since have justly declared the treaty void, and might have withdrawn its protection from the rulers of Oude. But it has hitherto been reluctant to have recourse to measures which would be fatal to the power and authority of a Royal race, who, whatever their faults towards their own subjects, have ever been faithful and true to their friendship with the English nation.

“ Nevertheless, the British Government has not failed to labour during all that time, earnestly and perseveringly, for the deliverance of the people of Oude from the grievous oppression and misrule which they have suffered.

“ Many years have passed since the Governor-General, Lord William Bentinck, perceiving that

every previous endeavour to ameliorate the condition of the people of Oude had been thwarted or evaded, made a formal declaration to the Court of Lucknow, that it would become necessary that he should proceed to assume the direct management of the Oude territories.

“ The words and the menace which were employed by Lord William Bentinck were eight years ago repeated in person by Lord Hardinge to the King. The Sovereign of Oude was on that day solemnly bid remember that, whatever might now happen, ‘ it would be manifest to all the world that he had received a friendly and a timely warning.’

“ But the friendly intentions of the British Government have been wholly defeated by the obstinacy, or incapacity, or apathy of the Viziers and Kings of Oude. Disinterested counsel and indignant censure, alternating through more than 50 years with repeated warning, remonstrance, and threats, have all proved ineffectual and vain. The chief condition of the treaty remains unfulfilled ; the promises of the King rest unperformed ; and the people of Oude are still the victims of incompetency, corruption, and tyranny, without remedy or hope of relief.

“ It is notorious throughout the land that the King, like most of his predecessors, takes no real share in the direction of public affairs.

“ The powers of government throughout his dominions are for the most part abandoned to worthless favourites of the Court, or to violent and corrupt men, unfit for their duties, and unworthy of trust.

“ The collectors of the revenue hold sway over their districts with

uncontrollable authority, extorting the utmost payment from the people, without reference to past or present engagements.

“The King’s troops, with rare exceptions, undisciplined and disorganised, and defrauded of their pay by those to whom it is entrusted, are permitted to plunder the villages for their own support, so that they have become a lasting scourge to the country they are employed to protect.

“Gangs of freebooters infest the districts. Law and justice are unknown, armed violence and bloodshed are daily events; and life and property are nowhere secure for an hour.

“The time has come when the British Government can no longer tolerate in Oude these evils and abuses, while its position under the treaty serves indirectly to sustain or continue to the Sovereign that protection which alone upholds the power whereby such evils are inflicted.

“Fifty years of sad experience have proved that the treaty of 1801 has wholly failed to secure the happiness and prosperity of Oude; and have conclusively shown that no effectual security can be had for the release of the people of that country from the grievous oppression they have long endured, unless the exclusive administration of the territories of Oude shall be permanently transferred to the British Government.

“To that end it has been declared by the special authority and consent of the Honourable the Court of Directors, that the treaty of 1801, disregarded and violated by each succeeding Sovereign of Oude, is henceforth wholly null and void.

“His Majesty Wajid Ali Shah

was invited to enter into a new engagement, whereby the government of the territories of Oude should be vested exclusively and for ever in the Hon. East India Company, while ample provision should be made for the dignity, affluence, and honour of the King and of his family.

“But His Majesty the King refused to enter into the amicable agreement which was offered for his acceptance.

“Inasmuch, then, as His Majesty Wajid Ali Shah, in common with all his predecessors, has refused, or evaded, or neglected to fulfil the obligation of the treaty of 1801, whereby he was bound to establish within his dominions such a system of administration as should be conducive to the prosperity and happiness of his subjects; and inasmuch as the treaty he thereby violated has been declared to be null and void; and inasmuch as His Majesty has refused to enter into other agreements which were offered to him in lieu of such treaty; and inasmuch as the terms of that treaty, if it had still remained in force, forbade the employment of British officers in Oude, without which no efficient system of administration could be established there, it is manifest to all that the British Government had but one alternative before it.

“Either it must altogether desert the people of Oude, and deliver them up helpless to oppression and tyranny, which, acting under the restrictions of treaty, it has already too long appeared to countenance; or it must put forth its own great power on behalf of a people for whose happiness it more than 50 years ago engaged to interpose, and must at

once assume to itself the exclusive and permanent administration of the territories of Oude.

"The British Government has had no hesitation in choosing the latter alternative.

"Wherefore proclamation is hereby made that the government of the territories of Oude is henceforth vested exclusively and forever, in the Hon. East India Company.

"All Amils, Nazims, Chuckledars, and other servants of the Durbar, all officers, civil and military, the soldiers of the State, and all the inhabitants of Oude, are required to render henceforth implicit and exclusive obedience to the officers of the British Government.

"If any officer of Durbar, Jageerdar, Zemindar, or other person shall refuse to render such obedience, if he shall withhold the payment of revenue, or shall otherwise dispute or defy the authority of the British Government, he shall be declared a rebel, his person shall be seized, and his jageers or lands shall be confiscated to the State.

"To those who shall immediately and quietly submit themselves to the authority of the British Government, whether Amils, Public Officers, Jageerdars, Zemindars, or other inhabitants of Oude, full assurance is hereby given of protection, consideration, and favour.

"The revenue of the districts shall be determined on a fair and settled basis.

"The gradual improvement of the Oude territories shall be steadily pursued.

"Justice shall be measured out with an equal hand.

"Protection shall be given to life and property, and every man

shall enjoy henceforth his just rights without fear of molestation."

WAR WITH PERSIA.—

When Tamerlane conquered Khorassan about the middle of the 14th century, Herat, which is situated in an extensive plain on the confines of Khorassan, and the old Douranee Empire of Affghanistan, fell under the dominion of Persia. But after various vicissitudes of fortune on the death of Nadir Shah it followed the fate of Affghanistan, which threw off the yoke of Persia, and acknowledged as its sovereign one of Nadir's generals, Ahmet Khan, who assumed the Crown at Khandahar. In 1829, Herat was governed in a state of independence by an Affghan prince, named Khamrân-Mirza, who, in order to obtain protection against his dangerous neighbour, the King of Cabul, acknowledged the sovereignty of Persia, and agreed to pay an annual tribute to the Shah. But the obligation was disregarded, and after a few years Khamrân-Mirza acted as an independent sovereign, and was accused by Mohammed Shah, the then King of Persia, of having carried off and sold into slavery a number of Persians. This was, perhaps, merely a pretext for hostilities; but whatever was the real cause of war, Mohammed Shah marched against Herat in 1836, and a long and obstinate siege followed, which ended in the withdrawal of the Persian army and abandonment of the attempt to take the city. The following description of the place shows the importance of its position in a strategical point of view:—

"Herat," says the historian of the Affghan War, "has with no

impropriety been described as the 'Gate of India.' Within the limit of the Heratee territory all the great roads leading on India converge. At other points, between Herat and Cabul, a body of troops unencumbered with guns, or having only a light field artillery, might make good its passage, if not actively opposed, across the stupendous mountain ranges of the Hindoo-Koosh; but it is only by the Herat route that a really formidable, well-equipped army could make its way upon the Indian frontier from the regions on the north-west. Both the nature and the resources of the country are such as to favour the success of the invader."*

On the 5th of January, 1853, an agreement, or convention as it was called, was entered into between the Persian Government and Colonel Sheil, the British Minister at the Court of Teheran, whereby the Shah undertook not to send troops to Herat, unless the Herat territory were invaded by a foreign army, and in that case, if troops were sent, to withdraw them as soon as the foreigners should retire. He engaged, also, not to interfere in the internal affairs of Herat, "except so far as interference existed in the time of Yar Mahomed Khan" (who had paid tribute money to the Shah as a sign of nominal fealty), and to recal within four months the Persian agent from Herat. If, however, Great Britain interfered in the affairs of Herat, the convention was to be invalid; and the British Minister was to use all his influence to induce foreign powers to leave Herat in a state of independence.

* Kaye's War in Affghanistan, vol. i. 203-4.

It is, however, right to state that this convention was never formally ratified by the British Government, although, as it was almost entirely unilateral on the side of Persia, there does not seem to have been any necessity for this to render it binding on the Government of the Shah.

In November, 1854, Mr. Murray was sent out to Persia as Envoy and Minister Plenipotentiary, and he remained at Teheran until the end of last year, when, in consequence of alleged insults to the British Mission and the undisguised enmity of the principal Persian Minister, Mr. Murray left Teheran in December, 1855, and retired with the rest of the Mission beyond the frontier of Persia. At the close of last year a rebellion broke out in Herat, the reigning Prince, Syud Mahomed, was killed, and Yuzoof Khan, a member of the old royal family of Persia, became the ruler of Herat. About this time, also, Dost Mahomed, who occupied the Throne of Cabul, advanced against Candahar, and took possession of the place; and the Persian Government made this the pretext for justifying the step they took of sending an army to besiege Herat. On the 25th of October it surrendered to the Persians, and the fall of Herat was immediately followed by a declaration of war against Persia on the part of Great Britain.

We are obliged to relate these events in a meagre and unsatisfactory manner, as the papers explanatory of the causes which led to the war with Persia have not yet been laid before Parliament, and we must, for the present, content ourselves with the reasons assigned in the proclamation of the Governor-

General of India, dated the 1st of November, when he announced the commencement of hostilities between Great Britain and Persia. The proclamation was as follows:—

“In the month of January, 1853, certain articles of agreement were concluded between Lieutenant-Colonel Sheil, Her Majesty’s Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at the Court of the Shah of Persia, and his Highness the Sudr Azim, or Prime Minister of the Persian Government.

“By those articles the Persian Government engaged not to send troops to Herat on any account, unless foreign troops—that is, troops from the direction of Cabul or Candahar or other foreign country—should invade Herat. In the event of troops being sent, the Persian Government engaged that the said troops should not enter the city of Herat, and that, on the return of the foreign troops towards their own territory, the Persian troops should be immediately withdrawn from the neighbourhood of Herat to Persian soil.

“The Persian Government also engaged to abstain from all interference whatsoever in the internal affairs of Herat, whether ‘in taking possession, or occupying, or assuming the sovereignty, or governing, except in so far as interference existed between the two parties during the lifetime of the late Yar Mahomed.’

“And, lastly, the Persian Government engaged to relinquish all pretension to and demand for the coinage, or the reading of the Khootbeh, or any other acknowledgment of allegiance or subjection on the part of the people of Herat to the Government of Persia.

“It was, at the same time, stipulated that, so long as there should be no interference of any sort whatever on the part of the British Government in the affairs of Herat, the engagements contracted by the Persian Government, as aforesaid, should remain in full force and effect. On the other hand it was agreed, in the name of the British Government, that ‘if any foreign Power, such as the Affghans or others,’ should wish to interfere with, or take possession of, Herat, the British Government, on the requisition of the Persian Ministers, would not object to restrain such foreign Power by friendly advice, ‘so that Herat might remain in its own state of independence.’

“While the British Government has faithfully and constantly adhered to the obligations which it accepted under the agreement of January, 1853, the Government of Persia has manifested a deliberate and persevering disregard of the reciprocal engagements by which, at the same time, it became bound, and is now endeavouring to subvert by force the independence of Herat, which was the declared object of the agreement in question.

“So far back as December, 1855, the Persian Government, by an article in the *Teheran Official Gazette*, announced its attention of despatching a force to Herat, alleging that the Ameer Dost Mahomed Khan, the ruler of Affghanistan, had been instigated by his ‘neighbours’ to possess himself of Kandahar; that, having with their assistance succeeded in that enterprise, he meditated an advance upon Herat; and that an armed demonstration in the direction of Herat was required for

the preservation of tranquillity in Khorassan.

“This assertion, that the ruler of Affghanistan was instigated by his ‘neighbours’ to occupy Kandahar, or that he was assisted by them in possessing himself of that city, or that he received advice or encouragement from them to advance upon Herat, was, if by those ‘neighbours’ the British Government is indicated, wholly untrue. No such instigation or assistance, encouragement, direct or indirect, had been given by the British Government; nor, so far as the British Government is informed, had there been, when the assertion was made, any act on the part of the Ameer Dost Mahomed Khan evincing a design to advance upon Herat.

“Nevertheless, the Persian Government has executed its intention. Not only have Persian troops invaded the territory of Herat, although the contingency which alone could justify such an act has not come to pass; but they have laid siege to the city, and have interfered in its internal affairs, while the Government of Teheran has not only assumed the right to nominate the ruler of Herat, but, in addressing the present chief of the city, has declared Herat to be Persian soil.

“The siege of Herat has now been carried on by the Persian army for many months. Before its commencement, and during its progress, the unfriendly sentiments of Persia towards the British Government have been scarcely veiled; and, recently, the movements of troops in different parts of Persia have indicated a determination to persist in an aggression which is as unprovoked as it is contrary to good faith.

“The conduct of the Persian Government has been pronounced by Her Majesty’s Government to constitute an act of open hostility against Great Britain. Reparation has been sought, but without success. The withdrawal of the Persian troops from the neighbourhood of Herat to Persian soil has been demanded, as a preliminary to the adjustment of differences to which the acts of Persia alone have given rise; but the demand has been evaded, and, according to the most recent accounts, a Persian army still invests Herat.

“Friendly remonstrance having failed, and a reasonable requisition having been rejected or put aside, it becomes incumbent on the British Government to take measures by which the Persian Government shall be convinced that solemn engagements contracted with Great Britain may not be violated with impunity, and by which effectual guarantees against continuous breach of faith shall be secured.”

The first rendezvous of the fleet and transports was at the port of Bunda Abbas, which they reached on the 23rd of November, and quitted on the 26th. On the 29th, four vessels of the hostile squadron appeared off Bushire, and on the following day the Governor of that place wrote to Commander Jones, the British Resident at the Persian Gulf, “begging to be apprised of the object of their visit.” Commander Jones, who had left Bushire to join the squadron, replied from on board of Rear-Admiral Leeke’s ship, by enclosing the Governor-General’s proclamation of war, and informed the Persian Governor that his own diplomatic functions had ceased.

The next step was to take possession of Karrak Island, to the north of Bushire, and this was effected without opposition. It was then determined to disembark the troops in Hallila Bay, about ten or twelve miles south of Bushire, and the operation commenced under the cover of gunboats on the morning of the 7th of December. A number of the enemy had posted themselves in a date grove, about 200 yards to the left of the beach; but after a few shots from the boats they retired, and the troops were landed without any casualty on that and the following day. On the 9th the army advanced to attack the village and old Dutch Fort of Reshire, about four miles south of Bushire, where the enemy had strongly entrenched themselves amidst the ruins of old houses, garden walls, and steep ravines. They were, however, driven from their defences by our troops, who behaved in the most gallant manner, and carried the place at the point of the bayonet. During the action, Brigadier Stopford, of H.M. 64th Regiment, and Lieutenant-Colonel Malet, 3rd Bombay L.C., were killed while leading on their men, and Lieutenants Utterson and Warren, 20th N.I., both fell. The fleet did good service by firing shells, which burst among the enemy, and caused them considerable loss.

The army halted at Reshire during the night, but Admiral Sir Henry Leeke pushed on with the fleet, and early on the morning of the 10th took up his position in the roadstead of Bushire. In the meantime Commander Jones had proceeded in a small steamer, carrying a flag of truce, to the town of Bushire, to summon the garrison to surrender on honour-

able terms; but on passing through the narrow channel that led to the town, two batteries opened upon the steamer, and several shots were fired, which compelled her to return. While the vessels of the fleet were taking up their positions on the morning of the 10th, a Persian boat came off from the shore with a flag of truce, to request, on the part of the Governor of Bushire, a delay of twenty-four hours. This was peremptorily refused, and the ships being placed in line of battle, with the Admiral's vessel in the centre, a cannonade commenced which was kept up between the fleet and the town for four hours and a half, at the expiration of which time the Persian batteries were silenced, and the flag-staff was cut down in token of submission. This happened before the land force had time to reach the place, so that when the troops came up all that Major-General Stalker had to do was to receive the surrender of the garrison; and the British flag was hoisted on the walls of Bushire. The Persian force within the walls had exceeded the number of 2000 men; but many effected their escape before the surrender took place, and many also were drowned in attempting to do so. The rest laid down their arms in front of the British line, and were next morning escorted by our cavalry some distance into the interior, and there suffered to disband. Bushire, therefore, was taken by the guns of the fleet, and it is a remarkable circumstance, that during the whole of the bombardment for upwards of four hours, although the hulls, masts, and rigging of the ships were frequently struck by the enemy's shot, not a single casualty

to life or limb occurred. Nothing could have exceeded the vigour and efficiency of all the arrangements, both by land and sea, which led to the success of the expedition, and both services vied with each other in the gallantry and skill with which they carried out the separate duties which each had to perform.

The British colours were hoisted at the Residency, and the town of Bushire was declared to be a military post under British rule, and temporarily subject to martial law. Amongst other regulations, it was proclaimed that the traffic in slaves was abolished, and that newly-imported negroes of every age and sex would be seized and set free.

As regards the prospects of the expedition, supposing that the difference with Persia is not, as there is every reason to hope, soon amicably settled, we of course need be under no apprehension from the enemy in the field. But the situation of Bushire is very unhealthy. It is a peninsula surrounded on the land side by marshy swamps, from which deadly exhalations arise in the heat of summer. And the access into the interior is so blocked up by a chain of lofty mountains as to be almost impracticable for an army. The paths which lead across these mountains wind through frightful defiles where a single false step precipitates the traveller into an abyss, and where a few marksmen could easily arrest the advance of an invading force. And if an attempt were made to turn the barrier which nature has interposed by marching either to Darâbgherd, on the east, or to Bebahân, on the west, difficulties of the same kind must be encountered, for the rocky

chain extends in both directions, and it would seem to be necessary for an invading army to be conveyed by sea further up the Persian Gulf and land in Khuzistan, in order to make any serious impression upon Persia.

CHINA. — An event occurred in the latter part of this year which has again involved us in hostilities with the Chinese Empire.

After the treaty which had been made with China at the conclusion of the war with that country in 1842, a supplementary treaty was made on the 8th of October, 1843, to two articles of which, the 9th and the 17th, it is necessary to call attention in order to understand correctly the merits of the dispute, of which the issue has been a fresh war with China.

By the 9th Article it is provided:—

“If lawless natives of China, having committed crimes or offences against their own Government, shall flee to Hong Kong, or to the English ships of war, or English merchant ships, for refuge, they shall, if discovered by the English officers, be handed over at once to the Chinese officers for trial and punishment: or if, before such discovery be made by the English officers, it should be ascertained or suspected by the officers of the Government of China, whither such criminals and offenders have fled, a communication shall be made to the proper English officer in order that the said criminals and offenders may be rigidly searched for, seized, and, on proof or admission of their guilt, delivered up. In like manner, if any soldier or sailor, or any other person, whatever his caste

or country, who is a subject of the Crown of England, shall, from any cause or on any pretence, desert, fly, or escape into the Chinese territory, such soldier or sailor, or other person, shall be apprehended and confined by the Chinese authorities, and sent to the nearest British Consular or other Government officer. In neither case shall concealment or refuge be afforded."

And by the 17th article:—

"1. Every British schooner, cutter, lorcha, &c., shall have a sailing letter or register in Chinese and English, under the seal and signature of the Chief Superintendent of Trade, describing her appearance, burden, &c.

"2. Every schooner, lorcha, and such vessel, shall report herself, as large vessels are required to do, at the Bocca Tigris; and when she carries cargo she shall also report herself at Whampoa, and shall, on reaching Canton, deliver up her sailing letter or register to the British Consul, who will obtain permission from the Hoppo for her to discharge her cargo, which she is not to do without such permission, under the forfeiture of the penalties laid down in the third clause of the General Regulations of Trade."

In March, 1855, a colonial ordinance was passed by the local Government at Hong Kong, which provided for the grant of registers to vessels renewable annually under certain conditions, and which enacted, amongst other things, that—

"From and after the passing of this ordinance no ship or vessel whatsoever owned by a British subject shall be at liberty to trade in any of the harbours of this colony, unless, in the case of an

outward trading ship or vessel, she be provided with a certificate of registry in conformity with the Imperial Acts of Parliament on that behalf; and in the case of a China trading ship or vessel she has in all respects complied with the requirements of this ordinance."

By this ordinance the Colonial Legislature took upon itself to grant registers to vessels provided they were owned by British subjects. But this was not in conformity with English law, for that law at the time when the ordinance was passed required other conditions beside that of British ownership (such, for instance as that a certain number of the crew should be British subjects) as preliminary to the right of obtaining a register. And the ordinance had not been confirmed by any competent authority in this country, nor (irrespective of treaty) could it, as against the Chinese, confer upon a Chinese vessel the rights and privileges of a British ship.

It appears that a lorcha, or vessel, so called from its Portuguese shape, had been built by a Chinese owner in 1854, and was ultimately sold to a Chinese Hong merchant at Canton. By him she was transferred to a Chinese, who was resident in the British colony of Hong Kong, where it had been latterly the custom of the Colonial Government, by virtue of the ordinance already quoted, to grant annual registers to such Chinese shipowners as had become tenants of Crown lands at Hong Kong, treating them as *quasi*-naturalized, although beyond all question, until they were actually naturalized by the only competent authority, an act of the British Parliament, or until, at all events,

[S]

they had received letters of denization from the Crown, they did not and could not become British subjects.

The lorcha in question had been furnished, on the 7th of August, 1854, with a colonial register, and, by the name of the *Arrow*, had been for some time trading in the Chinese waters under the protection of the British flag. She also had as master a young man who was a British subject, but the rest of her crew were Chinese. The register was renewable annually, and had been last renewed on the 27th of September, 1855. Her licence, therefore, under the register, expired on the 27th of September in the present year, and after that period she ceased to have any privilege which the colonial register could confer—even supposing that as against the Chinese authorities any act of the Colonial Government could have (independently of treaty) the effect of converting a vessel Chinese built, Chinese owned, and (with the exception of the master) Chinese manned, into a British vessel entitled to the protection of the British flag. Whether by virtue of treaty with China a colonial register had that effect in the case of the *Arrow*, so long as the conditions of the register were duly complied with, depends upon the question whether she was a *British* lorcha, or vessel within the meaning of the 17th article of the treaty of the 8th of October, 1843, which has been already quoted. But however this may be, it is clear that after the 27th of September, and before the renewal of her register, she was not entitled to any privilege, which could only be acquired under a register actually existing and in force.

It appears that the Chinese authorities at Canton had received information that one of the crew on board the *Arrow* was a native pirate, who had been actively engaged in a pirate fleet which had come into collision with a Chinese vessel of war. While she was lying, on the morning of the 8th of October, in the river near the Dutch Folly Fort, off Canton, the master at the time being absent, she was suddenly boarded by a body of Chinese officers, who came off in a war-boat, and the whole of the crew, except two—the number in the *Arrow* being fourteen, and all Chinese—were seized and pinioned, and put on board the war-boat, which remained close to the *Arrow*. There was contradictory evidence as to whether the British colours were flying at the time, but the fact seems to have been that they were. On hearing of this occurrence, Mr. Parkes, the British Consul at Canton, immediately proceeded to the war-boat and demanded that the men should be brought to the Consulate in order that the charge against them might be there investigated. The Chinese officers, however, refused on the ground that as they had reported the matter to their own authorities they must wait for orders from them. Mr. Parkes then wrote to Commissioner Yeh, the Governor of Canton, and made a similar demand on him. He required that the men who had been carried away from the *Arrow* should be returned to that vessel in his presence; and that then, if accused of any crime, they should be conveyed to the British Consulate, where, in conjunction with proper officers deputed by Commissioner Yeh for the purpose, he would investigate the case. At

the same time he wrote and informed Sir John Bowring, the British Plenipotentiary at Hong Kong, of what had happened. In answering this dispatch Sir John Bowring made a somewhat remarkable admission. He said—

“ *It appears, on examination, that the Arrow had no right to hoist the British flag; the licence to do so expired on the 27th of September, from which period she has not been entitled to protection. You will send back the register to be delivered to the Colonial-office.*

“ *But the Chinese had no knowledge of the expiry of the licence; nor do they profess that they had any other grounds for interference than the supposition that the owner is not a British subject; that, however, is a question for this Government, who granted the register; and it is clear that the Chinese have violated the 9th article of the Supplementary Treaty, which requires that all Chinese malfaisants in British ships shall be claimed through British authorities.*

“ You will inform the Imperial Commissioner that I require an apology for what has taken place, and an assurance that the British flag shall in future be respected; that forty-eight hours are allowed for this communication, which being passed, you are instructed to call on the naval authorities to assist you in forcing redress.”

But although Sir John Bowring admitted to Mr. Parkes that the *Arrow* was not entitled to the British flag at the time when the men were seized on board of her, he told Commissioner Yeh (in November), in answer to a letter from the Commissioner deny-

ing that the *Arrow* was ever entitled to a British register—

“ Whatever representations may have been made to your Excellency, *there is no doubt that the lorcha Arrow lawfully bore the British flag under a register granted by me, and that treaty obligations were violated by the seizure of her crew without the intervention of the Consul by your officers, and that this violation required a reparation as public as the outrage. I have undoubted evidence that the British flag was flying when it was pulled down by your officer, and I quite approve the conduct of the Consul in the whole of this affair.*”

Commissioner Yeh, in his reply to Mr. Parkes, stated that it had been ascertained that the lorcha was not the property of a foreigner (that is, of a British subject), and that when the men were seized no foreigner was seen on board (which was undoubtedly the fact), nor was there any flag hoisted at the time. He added—

“ Hereafter Chinese officers will on no account without reason seize and take into custody the people belonging to foreign lorchas, but when Chinese subjects build for themselves vessels, foreigners should not sell registers to them, for if this be done it will occasion confusion between native and foreign ships, and render it difficult to distinguish between them. Thus may all parties conform their proceedings to the conditions of the 9th article of the treaty.”

Mr. Parkes stated in answer that he had clear and satisfactory proof that the lorcha had the British ensign flying, and that an Englishman was on board when the

crew were seized. Commissioner Yeh, however, declined to make any reparation, and Sir John Bowring therefore determined to resort to force. He applied to Rear-Admiral Sir Michael Seymour, Commander-in-Chief of the British fleet on the China station, and a Chinese junk was seized by the *Coromandel* tender, and brought down to Whampoa. This produced no effect on the Chinese, and on the 23rd of October Admiral Seymour proceeded on board the *Coromandel*, and, accompanied by a fleet of gun-boats, took a number of forts that defended the approaches to Canton, and burnt several of the buildings. On the 25th, the British took possession of the Dutch Folly, a fort mounting 50 guns, and situated on an island opposite Canton; and as the defences of the city were now in our hands, an attempt was made to arrange matters amicably before further hostilities were resorted to. Commissioner Yeh offered to surrender ten out of the twelve men who had been seized, but this was declined. He then sent the twelve, but demanded that two of them, who were charged with having been guilty of piracy, should be at once returned, to be dealt with according to Chinese law. As Mr. Parkes, however, had in his original demand required that the men should be sent back to the *Arrow* as publicly as they had been taken, and no apology was tendered by Commissioner Yeh, he refused to receive them, and the men were again taken away by the Chinese. Sir John Bowring now resolved to make a further demand, and Mr. Parkes was instructed to write to the Chinese High Commissioner, and require

for all foreign representatives the same free access to the authorities and city of Canton as was enjoyed by treaty at the other four ports and denied at Canton alone. This claim was founded on various treaties or conventions, the first of which was the Treaty of Nankin, dated the 29th of August, 1842, in which it was stated that,

“His Majesty the Emperor of China agrees that British subjects, with their families and establishments, shall be allowed to reside for the purpose of carrying on their mercantile pursuits, without molestation or restraint, at the cities and towns of Canton, Foochowfoo, Amoy, Ningpo, and Shanghai.”

In the Supplementary Treaty of Hoomum-Chae of the 8th of October, 1843, it was recorded that “the Treaty of perpetual peace and friendship provides for British subjects and their families residing at the cities and towns of Canton, Foochowfoo, Amoy, Ningpo, and Shanghai without molestation and restraint.” And in the further treaty, signed at Bocca Tigris on the 4th of April, 1846, it was said — “His Majesty the Emperor of China having on his own part distinctly stated that when in the course of time mutual tranquillity shall have been insured, it will be safe and right to admit foreigners into the city of Canton; and the local authorities being for the present unable to coerce the people of that city, the Plenipotentiaries on either side mutually agree that the execution of the above measure shall be postponed to a more favourable period; but the claim of right is by no means yielded or abandoned on the part of Her Britannic Majesty.”

Finally, in the article agreed upon at Canton, on the 6th of April, 1847, it was stated—

“It is now agreed that two years from this day’s date British officers and people shall have free entrance into the city.”

These stipulations had been evaded; but for many years successive Secretaries of State in this country had refused to enforce them, and enjoined upon the authorities at Hong Kong the greatest circumspection in attempting to secure their fulfilment. Sir John Bowring, however, seems to have thought, most unfortunately in our opinion, that the present was a good opportunity for compelling the Chinese to yield the point. This was shifting the ground of the quarrel and introducing a new and perplexing element of dispute.

No answer being returned to the Consul’s demand, Sir Michael Seymour, on the 27th, opened fire upon some Government buildings in Canton, amongst which was Commissioner Yeh’s residence, and at the same time shelled a body of Chinese troops who had taken up their position on some rising ground in the rear of the city.

A proclamation was now issued, under the seal of the High Commissioner, offering a reward of thirty dollars for the head of every Englishman. Our fire was kept up during the following day, and on the 29th, a practicable breach having been effected in the walls, a body of seamen and marines was landed, who soon mounted the parapet of the wall and blew to pieces the city gate. The Chinese troops kept up a desultory fire from the streets and houses, by which three of our men were killed and eleven were wounded. We penetrated, how-

ever, into the city, and Commissioner Yeh’s own residence was for the rest of the day in our possession. But at sunset the attacking force was withdrawn and re-embarked on board the vessels. A further correspondence now took place with the High Commissioner, and Admiral Seymour proposed that there should be a personal conference between them; but this the Commissioner declined. On the 3rd of November the attack upon Canton was renewed; but our fire was confined as much as possible to the destruction of Government buildings and property. On the 5th, a large body of war-junks, which were at anchor below the Dutch Folly, and protected by the French Folly Fort, was attacked by two of our steamers and a number of gun-boats, and a spirited fire was kept up on both sides for upwards of half an hour, when the Chinese were driven out of the junks, and their vessels were destroyed. At the same time, the French Folly Fort was silenced and taken possession of by our men. In this smart action we only lost one man killed and four wounded. On the 12th of November, Admiral Seymour sent a summons to the Chief Mandarin in command of the Bogue Forts, requiring him to surrender them, and promising that they should remain uninjured, and be given back when the present differences were brought to a satisfactory conclusion. This was refused, the Chief Mandarin replying that he could not deliver up the forts, as if he did so he would lose his head, and must therefore fight. Sir Michael Seymour, therefore, immediately commenced the attack, and on that and the following day the whole of the Bogue Forts were

taken with hardly a casualty on our side, although the forts mounted upwards of 400 guns.

The following is Admiral Seymour's account of the capture of the Bogue Forts:—

“On the following morning I sent a summons to the Chief Mandarin to deliver up the forts till the Viceroy's conduct could be submitted to the Emperor of China, pledging myself that the forts should remain uninjured, and be given back when the present differences shall be terminated. This being refused, the squadron then attacked the two Wantung Island Forts from the Bremer Channel side, and they were taken possession of by the boats and Royal Marines after a considerable, though ill-directed resistance, of about an hour. These forts were fully manned, had upwards of 200 guns mounted, and were found stronger than when captured in 1841. The Chinese troops stood to their guns up to the moment our men entered the embrasures. The Mandarins had boats in readiness to facilitate their own escape, leaving their unfortunate followers, who rushed into the water until they were assured of their safety by the efforts made to save them. They were afterwards landed on the main.

“One boy killed and four men wounded, on board the *Nankin*, were happily the extent of our casualties, though stinkpots were freely thrown at those who first entered the forts.

“On the 13th the Annunghoy Forts, on the opposite side of the Bogue entrance, mounting together 210 guns, were similarly attacked and taken, and, though some resistance was offered, I am thankful to state without a casualty on our side.”

Soon after the outbreak of hostilities, the Chinese fired by mistake from one of their forts upon an American man-of-war's boat, in consequence of which the American commander, Commodore Armstrong, opened fire upon the fort, and soon reduced it to silence. But as what had happened was evidently an accident, and no outrage upon the United States' flag was intended, the Americans took no further part in the contest.

On the night of the 14th of December the Chinese set fire to the foreign factories close to Canton, and the buildings were almost entirely destroyed.

These lamentable events originated, as we have seen, in the affair of the *Arrow*; but hostilities were kept up long after ample reparation had been obtained for the alleged insult offered by the Chinese to the British flag. The avowed object now was to compel Commissioner Yeh to concede to the British Plenipotentiary the right to enter Canton—a new and perfectly distinct cause of quarrel. This was plainly declared by Mr. Consul Parkes, at an interview he had with a deputation of Canton merchants on the 15th of November, when he said that if “simple reparation for outrage in the *Arrow* case had been all we required, the Admiral would doubtless have been long ago satisfied with what had been done; but that a principle was at stake which could not be abandoned.” And he proceeded to state that that principle was access to the authorities at Canton.

Nothing further of importance occurred this year, as Admiral Seymour was obliged to wait for reinforcements, and until their arrival he assumed a defensive position.

CHAPTER XII.

UNITED STATES.—*The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of April, 1850—Question of the Mosquito Protectorate—History of Greytown—Nature of Disputes between Great Britain and the United States—Proclamation declaring the Bay Islands a British Colony—Offence given by this to the United States—Correspondence between Mr. Buchanan and the Earl of Clarendon on the subject—Failure of proposal to refer the question to decision of a third Power—Convention with the Republic of Honduras—Contest resulting from the attempt to introduce Slavery into Kansas—Account of the state of the Territory—Struggle between the House of Representatives and the Senate on the question of the Army Appropriation Bill—Extraordinary Meeting of Congress convoked—Termination of the Dispute—Mode of electing the President in the United States—Names of the different Candidates—Manifesto of Mr. Buchanan—Colonel Fremont—Election of Mr. Buchanan—Dismissal of the British Minister and three Consuls from the United States—Dispatch of Mr. Marcy to the Earl of Clarendon on the subject.*

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.—TOPICS.—*Question of Slavery—Kansas—Customs—Army and Navy—Relations with Foreign Powers—Resolutions of the Paris Conference respecting Maritime Law—Nicaragua—Isthmus of Panama—Conclusion.*

UNITED STATES.—A dispute arose this year between England and the United States respecting Central America; and in order to understand its nature, it is necessary to give a brief narrative of some events that have happened in that part of the world.

By the term Central America is meant the States of Guatemala, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Salvador, and (Spanish) Honduras, which formerly constituted the kingdom or vice-royalty of Guatemala previous to the revolution or series of revolutions which severed them from Spain.

On the 19th of April, 1850, a treaty or convention was concluded between Great Britain and the United States relative to the

projected establishment of a ship-canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by way of the river San Juan de Nicaragua. This treaty was known as the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, because it was negotiated between Sir Henry Lytton Bulwer, as Minister Plenipotentiary on the part of England, and Mr. Clayton, Secretary of State of the United States, and it became afterwards the subject of a serious misunderstanding between the two countries.*

By the first article of the treaty, the Governments of Great Britain and the United States declared that neither the one nor the other would ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control

* The treaty was ratified on July 4, 1850.

over the ship-canal; and agreed that neither would ever erect or maintain any fortifications commanding the same, or in the vicinity thereof, or occupy, or fortify, or colonize, or assume or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito Coast, or any part of Central America: nor would either make use of any protection which either afforded or might afford, or any alliance which either had or might have, to or with any State or people, for the purpose of erecting or maintaining any such fortifications, or of occupying, fortifying, or colonizing Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito Coast, or any part of Central America, or of assuming or exercising dominion over the same.

On the 28th of May following, Lord Palmerston, who was then Foreign Secretary, wrote to Mr. Henry Bulwer, and informed him that, although the British Government were bound in honour to protect the Mosquitos—an obligation which had subsisted for nearly two centuries—they thought that the protection might be afforded as effectually as formerly in a different way, without any direct interference by a resident British agent in the internal affairs of that country. And he proposed that treaties should be concluded with the States of Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica, which border on the Mosquito territory, for the purpose of defining the boundaries between those States respectively and Mosquito, saying, that if such boundaries were once fixed and established by treaty, the duties of protection would have been usefully performed; and he invited the co-operation of the United States Government in making such an arrangement. He

added, however, that as the port of Greytown in the Mosquito territory would be one of the outlets of the proposed inter-oceanic communication, it was necessary that it should be under the control of some efficient and organized Government, and said:—"But in the present condition of the Mosquito nation, the chief of that country could not establish any sufficiently well-organized system of administration in Greytown without the assistance of the direct and detailed intervention of British agency in that town.

"In order to obviate these inconveniences, Her Majesty's Government would propose that the treaty to be concluded between the Mosquitos and Costa Rica should so fix the boundary between those States as to include Greytown, and a sufficient district to the north of Greytown, within the limits of Costa Rica; some suitable and adequate compensation being made to the Mosquitos for this cession on their part."

The place called Greytown, here spoken of, is a port at the mouth of the river San Juan, and would be one of the outlets of the proposed inter-oceanic communication. It was claimed both by Nicaragua and Costa Rica, but the British Government considered it as part of the Mosquito territory, and as such entitled to our "protection." The United States' Government, however, insisted that Greytown should belong to Nicaragua. The Nicaraguans had seized it in 1843 or 1844, while it was known as Port San Juan; but as the British Government were satisfied that it rightfully belonged to the Mosquitos, on the refusal of Nicaragua to give it up we took forcible possession of it in January, 1848,

and from that time, under the name of Greytown, it continued to be held by the Mosquitos under the protection of Great Britain. This was one subject of dispute in what was called the Central America question ; and moreover, the United States' Government contended that by the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty Great Britain was precluded from giving any practical effect to her protectorate of the Mosquitos, inasmuch as she had bound herself neither to "occupy, fortify, colonize, nor assume nor exercise any dominion over" the Mosquito coast, or any part of Central America. To this the British Government answered, that up to March, 1849, that is, one whole year after the capture of San Juan de Nicaragua by the British forces, the United States' Government made no allusion to this act. But in November, 1849, Mr. Laurence, who had then just arrived in England as the representative of the United States' Government, addressed a note to Lord Palmerston, not asking any question as to the British protectorate of Mosquito, but requesting to know whether the British Government would join with the United States in guaranteeing the neutrality of a ship-canal, railway, or other communication between the two oceans, to be opened to the world, and common to all nations, and whether the British Government intended to occupy or colonize Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito Coast so called, or any part of Central America. To this note Lord Palmerston replied by stating that Her Majesty's Government had no intention to occupy or colonize Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito Coast, nor any part of Central America, and that

his Government would feel great pleasure in combining and co-operating with the Government of the United States for the purpose of assisting the operations of a company which might be formed with a view to establish a general communication by canal or railroad across the isthmus.

Moreover, in drawing up the treaty, both Mr. Clayton and Sir H. L. Bulwer referred to the notes which had passed between Lord Palmerston and Mr. Laurence, and made use of the terms which had been there employed, from which it must of necessity be inferred that they meant to transfer to the convention, with the words which they borrowed, the meaning which had previously been attached to those words in the documents from which they extracted them ; and a reference to such documents would at once show that Mr. Laurence, while he asked Her Majesty's Government whether it meant to occupy, fortify, colonize, or assume or exercise dominion over Mosquito, did not allude to the protectorate of Great Britain over that country ; and that Lord Palmerston, in declaring that Her Majesty's Government did not intend to do any of these things, expressly left the question concerning the political relations between Great Britain and the Mosquitos untouched.

They, or rather the Earl of Clarendon, who was then the Foreign Secretary, further contended that, under the literal interpretation of the treaty, even supposing all mention of protection had been omitted, there was nothing to exclude the right of protection as afforded by Great Britain to the Mosquitos. He said :—"Defending or protecting is a temporary

act of friendship; occupying, colonizing, fortifying, or acquiring sovereignty, are acts which have a permanent result.

“It has never been held that neutral territories or kingdoms over which other kingdoms are prohibited by treaty from acquiring dominion—which other kingdoms cannot colonize, occupy, nor fortify—may not be defended by such kingdoms at the desire and request of the neutral State; although it would doubtless be necessary for any nation undertaking such defence to declare formally and promise clearly that it would not turn this transitory and allowable act into one of a continuous nature, which engagements had prohibited.”

And he added:—“In short, the practical question at issue relative to Greytown, and that part of the Mosquito country bordering upon the river San Juan, is not whether Great Britain should, directly or indirectly, exercise dominion over the same, but whether Nicaragua, or some other equally independent State, should obtain possession thereof in a manner consonant with the honourable obligations of Great Britain, the peace of the Central American continent, and the safety from persecution of the Mosquito Indians; or, on the other hand, whether Nicaragua should be put in possession of that territory in a manner almost certain to produce hostilities between Nicaragua and Costa Rica, and to lead to the persecution and destruction of the Mosquito people; an alternative to which Great Britain could not consent, and which the Government of the United States could have no motive in requiring.”

This was the state of the dispute as regarded Greytown and

the protectorate of the Mosquitos up to the beginning of 1854, but in the meantime another difficulty had arisen.

During the summer of 1852 a proclamation in the name of the British Government was published and circulated through the British settlements at Honduras by the colonial authorities at Belize, stating that the Queen “had been pleased to constitute” and make the islands of Ruatan, Bonacca, Utilia, Barbarat, Helené and Morat to be a colony, to be known and designated as “The Colony of the Bay Islands.” These islands lie about 30 miles off the coast of Honduras, and in virtue of our settlement at Belize in the Bay of Honduras, we had at various times asserted a claim to them, especially Ruatan. In 1841 the British Superintendent at Belize landed with a body of men at Ruatan and hoisted the British flag there, since which time it had been under British control, and a considerable number of settlers had taken up their abode there under the protection of the British authorities. The formal constitution, however, of the Bay Islands into a British colony gave great offence to the United States, and a Committee of the Senate on Foreign Relations, to whom at the end of 1852 the question was referred by Mr. Fillmore, the then President, entered into an elaborate view of the whole subject, and reported as their opinion, “That the islands of Ruatan, Bonacca, Utilia, Barbarat, Helené, and Morat, in and near the Bay of Honduras, constitute part of the republic of Honduras, and therefore form a part of Central America; and, in consequence, that any occupation or colonization of these

islands by Great Britain would be a violation of the treaty of the 19th of April, 1850."

This view was also forcibly insisted on in a long "statement," addressed by Mr. Buchanan, the American Minister at our Court, to Lord Clarendon, in January, 1854. He said :—

"Great Britain has not even retired from the Island of Ruatan in obedience to the convention. Here no question can possibly arise from any alleged Mosquito protectorate. This is clearly a Central American island belonging to the State of Honduras, and but 30 miles distant from her port of Truxillo. If the convention plainly embraces any object whatever, surely this must be Ruatan.

"And yet Great Britain has not only continued to occupy this island, but, since the date of the convention, she has actually established a colonial government over it; and not over it alone, but, adding thereto five other neighbouring islands on the Central American coast, has converted them all into the British colony of the 'Bay Islands.' Public sentiment is quite unanimous in the United States that the establishment of this colony is a palpable violation both of the letter and the spirit of the Clayton and Bulwer Convention.

"Ruatan is well known to be an island of great value and importance on account of its excellent harbours, which are rare along that coast. Indeed, it has been described by a Spanish author 'as the key of the Bay of Honduras, and the focus of the trade of the neighbouring countries.' Such is its commanding geographical position, that Great

Britain, in possession of it, could completely arrest the trade of the United States on its passage to and from the isthmus. In vain may the convention have prohibited Great Britain from erecting or maintaining any fortifications commanding the Nicaraguan Canal, or in other portions of Central America, if she shall continue to exercise dominion over the 'Bay Islands.'"

To this Lord Clarendon replied, that it was never in the contemplation of the British Government, nor in that of the Government of the United States, that the treaty of 1850 should interfere in any way with Her Majesty's settlement of Belize or its dependencies; and that it was not necessary that this should have been particularly stated, inasmuch as it was generally considered that the term "Central America"—a term of modern invention—could only appropriately apply to those States at one time united under the name of the "Central American Republic," and now existing as five separate republics; but, in order that there should be no possible misconception at any future period relative to this point, the two negotiators, at the time of ratifying the treaty, exchanged declarations to the effect that neither of the Governments they represented had meant in such treaty to comprehend the settlement and dependencies in question.

He added, also, that it could not be disputed that whenever Ruatan had been permanently occupied, either in remote or recent times, by anything more than a military guard or flagstaff, the occupation had been by British subjects, and that it had been long considered one of the dependencies

of Belize. But, in order to put an amicable end to the differences which had sprung up between the two countries, Lord Clarendon intimated the willingness of the British Government to arrange on fair terms those differences. The question as to the Bay Islands was simply one of fact, whether they were dependencies of Belize or attached to some Central American State; and with respect to the Mosquito question, after admitting that, although his Government did not, by the treaty of 1850, abandon the right of Great Britain to protect the Mosquitos, yet it did intend to reduce and limit the exercise of that right, he proposed that the Governments of Great Britain and the United States should at once endeavour to come to some friendly understanding as to the Government which should be definitively formed at Greytown, in order to admit of the Mosquito authority being withdrawn therefrom; and as to the engagements which such Government should enter into with regard to the claims of Costa Rica, and the future non-molestation of the Mosquitos; and that the two Governments should endeavour, in the same manner, to come to some friendly understanding as to the mode by which protection might be most effectually afforded to the Mosquito Indians.

Subsequently Lord Clarendon offered on the part of the British Government to submit the question of the right interpretation of the Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, which was the whole point in dispute, to the arbitration of a third Power, but this proposal failed. With reference to it Mr. Marcy, the American Secretary of State, wrote, on the 24th of May in the

present year, to Mr. Dallas, the United States Minister in this country, and said:—

“All those questions of political geography regard, in the first instance, the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the independent States of Central America. Great Britain and the United States have no pretension thus to intervene, except for the purpose of defining their own mutual obligations, arising out of engagements they may have contracted in order to assure how far they concerned the neutrality and independence of the American isthmus. Regarded only as collateral considerations, affecting the construction of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain, they are questions which, if not determinable by agreement between the two Governments themselves, the President would not decline to refer to arbitration. He is aware of the existence of many practical obstacles to the adjustment of any international difference of this nature by arbitration, of which difficulties Great Britain and the United States had experience in the attempt to settle, by such means, a previous controversy on the subject of the boundary between the United States and the British provinces in North America.

“The President does not doubt that any one of the Powers of Europe which should consent to undertake the task of such arbitration as is now proposed, would perform the duty with perfect impartiality; but to apply to any Power to do this would be to ask of them an act, which, if granted, would add to their own domestic duties the labours and burden of settling the complicated differ-

ences of other Governments. He would greatly prefer that, in a controversy like the present, turning on points of political geography, the matter should be referred to some one or more of those eminent men of science who do honour to the intellect of Europe and America, and who, with the previous consent of their respective Governments, might well undertake the task of determining such questions to the acceptance as well of Her Majesty's Government as that of the United States."

The questions of the Mosquito Indians and the Bay Islands were ultimately settled this year by a convention concluded between the British Government and the Republic of Honduras on the 27th of August, whereby in effect the sovereignty of the disputed territory was acknowledged to be vested in Honduras.* The two important articles of the convention were the following:—

"Article 1. The Republic of Honduras engages not to disturb the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty in the enjoyment of any property of which they may be in possession in the islands of Ruatan, Bonacca, Helené, Uilla, Barbarat, and Morat, situated in the Bay of Honduras.

"Article 2. Her Britannic Majesty agrees to recognise the mid channel of the river Wanx or Segovia, which falls into the Caribbean Sea at Cape Gracias à Dios, as the boundary between the Republic of Honduras and the terri-

tory of the Mosquito Indians, without prejudice, however, to any question of boundary between the Republics of Honduras and of Nicaragua.

"And whereas the Mosquito Indians have heretofore possessed and exercised rights in and over the territories lying between the river Wanx or Segovia and the Roman River, Her Britannic Majesty agreed to recommend to the Mosquito Indians to renounce any such rights in favour of the Republic of Honduras, on condition of receiving from the Republic some reasonable sum by way of annuity for a limited period, to be paid half-yearly, as an indemnity and compensation for the loss and extinction of their interest in the said territory. When such an arrangement shall have been acceded to by the Mosquito Indians, Her Britannic Majesty engages to recognise the sovereignty over the said territory as belonging to the Republic of Honduras; and Her Britannic Majesty and the Republic will, within twelve months thereafter, appoint two Commissioners, one to be named by each party, for the purpose of determining the amount, the period of duration, and the time, place, and mode of payment of the annuity so to be paid to the Mosquito Indians as indemnity and compensation.

"And whereas British subjects have, by grant, lease, or otherwise, heretofore obtained from the Mosquito Indians interest in various lands situated within the territory above described, lying between the river Wanx or Segovia and the river Roman, the Republic of Honduras engages to respect and maintain such interests. And it is further agreed that the Commis-

* A Convention was also agreed upon and signed by Lord Clarendon and Mr. Dallas, the American Minister here, relative to these questions, but it was not ratified by the President, at all events not this year.

sioners mentioned in the present article shall investigate the claims of British subjects arising out of such grants or leases, or otherwise; and all British subjects whose claims shall by the Commissioners be pronounced well-founded and valid shall be quieted in the possession of their respected interests in the said lands."

The question of slavery has long been felt to be one of the most momentous affecting the future destinies of the United States. It is the dark cloud in the horizon, which threatens the approaching storm. Between the Northern and Southern States there is on this subject an irreconcilable difference of opinion; and, as the interests of the Southern landowners are supposed to be inextricably bound up in a continuance of the system of slavery, the agitation set on foot by the abolitionists excites feelings of hostility and bitterness, of which it is difficult on this side of the Atlantic to form an idea. The territory of Kansas, which had not yet been formally adopted amongst the States of the Union, became this year the scene of a sanguinary struggle between the two parties. Under the terms of the Missouri compromise, as it is called, which means that slavery is to be restricted to such States as lie south of a certain geographical line, Kansas was entitled to be considered a free-soil territory. But to this the slave-owners would not consent, and they insisted upon the right to import slavery within it contrary to the wishes of a large proportion of the inhabitants. This led to violent contests and acts of disgraceful outrage, which continued during a great part of the present year.

At a great meeting held at New York in the latter part of August, General Reeder, the former Governor of Kansas, thus described the condition of that territory:—

"Look upon the plains of Kansas, and who is there with burning eloquence sufficient to depict the state of things that exists there? Baffled and defeated before, I confess my total inability to convey to you a realising sense of the true state of affairs in Kansas. No man can realise it unless he has actually had a part in the troubles there, and has witnessed for himself the outrages which have been there committed. I can only say that upon the plains of Kansas, under the shadow of the stars and stripes, and under the protection of the constitution of this model republic, there is to be found a people whose condition, civil and political, you would improve if you were to transfer them to the Government of the Czar of Russia, the Emperor of Austria or France. Is this true? Why, it is capable of the plainest and surest demonstration to any man who knows all the facts in the case, or even a few of them. It is an admitted, unquestioned, and undenied truth, that the people of that territory have no act or part in their own government, and they have no laws of their own making. They have no taxes of their own levying; they have no officers of their own electing; they are slaves—political slaves, subjugated by a foreign power, with no shadow or semblance of self-government—the complete subjects of the border counties of the State of Missouri, who dictate to them their laws, institutions, and officers. Are the subjects of France, Austria, or Russia less free, politically, than

these? I tell you their condition would be improved if you could spread them over such a government as that of France, Austria, or Russia. If you did that, they would at least have security for life, liberty, and property, and they would have their judicial tribunals to which they could appeal for a redress of their wrongs, for indemnity for property destroyed, houses rifled, and for punishment for robberies and murders. Lawlessness, outrage, rapine, and crime run riot over the beautiful prairies of Kansas, and there is no arm of the law to stay their course. On the contrary, the robbers, ravishers, and murderers of Kansas have in their own hands the arms of the law, and they are made the ministers of this awful and horrible system of civil, political, and social oppression."

In another part of his speech Governor Reeder said:—

"Let any man in the audience take the map of his country, and he will perceive that the territory of Kansas is only 200 miles wide north and south, and extending nearly 900 miles to the summit of the Rocky Mountains; but beyond that, to the shores of the Pacific Ocean, he will find that there is territory enough to make six States as large as Pennsylvania. With a majority of free men upon the plains of Kansas, (and it is a slave State,) I will thank any man to tell me how he is going to save the second, the third, or the fourth, each one further and further out of your reach—each one with more slave States intervening. Is the thing possible? Is it not obviously palpable that if we lose the State of Kansas we lose that entire body of States at the Pacific Ocean, and when we have lost them and have

thus isolated the territory of New Mexico which lies below, and left it to be carried by the slave States on the North—will any one reflecting man tell me how much of the territory of New Mexico we will get? Will he tell me how this is to be had? Will he tell me that sufficient numbers can be got there through the slave States to prevail against the violence and the force of the slave States that will be brought to subdue it? No; they will all be lost, and this entire territory will be handed over to slavery. This half of a continent is all lost to the North and to freedom."

He concluded by an energetic appeal for assistance to be furnished to those who were fighting the battle of freedom on the soil of Kansas.

"What, then, will their brethren give them to sustain them in this cause? Now is the time. It might as well not be given at all as to be given when the battle is lost. Then give freely if you would aid this cause. Men must be sent there immediately—they must be transported—they must be fed. There ought to be not less than 3000 men put upon that soil. They are needed to repel invading forces from Missouri. If a wall were erected between Kansas and Missouri our aid would not be needed; 200 dollars will equip, transport, and feed a man as long as he will be needed. This great city of New York might give 1,000,000 dollars to this cause. It would return to them increased tenfold within the next decade, from the commerce resulting from the demand for freemen in that vast territory, and from the establishment of the Pacific Railroad. This is putting

it upon pecuniary grounds alone, and saying nothing of the higher considerations which appeal to every man's heart."

The question whether Kansas was to be a slave-holding or a free-soil State became the cause of a serious difference between the House of Representatives and the Senate. The ordinary session of Congress was to terminate about the middle of August, but it was necessary to vote previously the Army Estimates, and provide for the payment of the forces and maintenance of the military establishments throughout the Union. The House of Representatives knew well that unless some legal restriction was passed the Executive would employ the military power of the Republic in handing over the territory of Kansas to the pro-slavery party, and this they were determined, if possible, to prevent. They therefore insisted on appending to the Appropriation Bill, which granted the supply, the following proviso:—

"Provided nevertheless, that no part of the military force of the United States herein provided for shall be employed in aid of the enforcement of the enactments of the alleged Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Kansas, recently assembled at Shawnee Mission, until Congress shall have enacted either that it was or was not a valid Legislative Assembly, chosen in conformity with the organic law by the people of the said territory: and provided that, until Congress shall have decided on the validity of the said Legislative Assembly at Kansas, it shall be the duty of the President to use the military force in said territory to preserve the peace, suppress insurrection, repel invasion, and

protect persons and property therein and upon the national highways in the State of Missouri from unlawful seizures and searches. And be it further provided, that the President is required to disarm the present organized militia of the Territory of Kansas, and recall all the United States' arms therein distributed, and to prevent armed men from going into said territory to disturb the public peace, or aid in the enforcement of resistance of real or pretended laws."

This clause was struck out by the Senate; but when the Bill was referred back to the House of Representatives it was again restored. Conferences between the two Houses took place, but in vain. Each obstinately adhered to its resolution; and matters remained in this dead-lock until the moment for prorogation arrived, on the 18th of August, and the two Chambers stood adjourned, leaving the Executive Government without the means of paying the army of the State.

The President, however, acted with vigour. He instantly convened an extraordinary meeting of Congress, to assemble on the 21st of August next, three days following; and in his proclamation assigned as his reason, that while hostilities existed with various Indian tribes on the remote frontiers of the United States, and in other respects the public peace was seriously threatened, Congress had adjourned without granting necessary supplies for the army, depriving the Executive of the power to perform its duty in relation to the common defence and security.

When Congress met on the 21st the President sent them a mes-

sage, in which he pointed out the deplorable results that would follow if provision were not instantly made for the pay of the troops. He said,—

“To refuse supplies to the army is to compel the complete cessation of all its operations, and practical disbandment, and thus to invite hordes of predatory savages from the western plains and Rocky Mountains to spread devastation along a frontier of more than 4000 miles in extent, and to deliver up the sparse population of a vast tract of country to rapine and murder. Such, in substance, would be the direct and immediate effects of the refusal of Congress, for the first time in the history of the Government, to grant supplies,—the inevitable waste of millions of public treasure—the infliction of extreme wrong upon all persons connected with the military establishment by service, employment, or contracts—the recall of our forces from the field—the fearful sacrifice of life, and incalculable destruction of property on the remote frontiers—the striking of our national flag on the battlements of the fortresses which defend our maritime cities against foreign invasion—the violation of the public honour and good faith, and the discredit of the United States in the eyes of the civilised world.”

The contest between the two Houses was again renewed; but at last, on the 30th of August, the House of Representatives gave way, and by a majority of four—the numbers being 101 to 97—they passed the Army Appropriation Bill without the objectionable clause. This was immediately accepted by the Senate, and the extra session of Congress was declared at an end.

VOL. XCVIII.

During the greatest part of the year the all-absorbing question in the United States was the election of a new President, whose tenure of office will commence in March, 1857. This, as perhaps our readers are aware, is not determined by universal suffrage, but by means of an Electoral College, a sort of breakwater erected by the Constitution against the full rush of the tide of Democracy. It consists of delegates from each State of the Union, proportioned to the number of members which each State sends to Congress, together with two more, called “Senatorial Members,” corresponding to the two representatives which every State of the Union has in the Senate. No senator, representative, or person holding any office under the Government, can be a member of the Electoral College. It was, no doubt, originally intended that this body should exercise its free and unfettered discretion in the choice of a President; but in practice this has long ceased to be the case, and the members are nothing more than delegates, who vote in conformity with the views of the predominant majorities of the particular States which have returned them respectively to the College. Hence the result of the election virtually depends upon the absolute majority which any candidate for the Presidency can obtain amongst the voters in the different States who return the members of the Electoral College. In this College, the members vote for a President and Vice-President separately, and the list specifying each vote is signed, sealed, and sent to Washington, to be opened in the presence of both Houses by the President of the Senate. The

[T]

candidates having the majority are declared President and Vice-President for four years. If no one name has a majority—which, when there are three or more candidates, may happen—the House of Representatives elects from among those who have the highest number; but in this case it votes by States, that is, each State has only one vote for President, though it may, like New York, have more than thirty members in the Chamber. The Vice-President (who is also Speaker of the Senate) may be elected first, if he is not fixed on by the majority of the College, and this provides for the difficulty that would arise from Congress not being able to agree on the appointment of President before the 4th of March; the Vice-President being once elected, if the decision of the House is protracted too long, whoever is Vice-President on that date becomes *ex officio* the chief magistrate of the Republic.

The following are the names of the different candidates for the offices of President and Vice-President, as put in nomination by the various political parties, known in the United States by designations which may excite a smile on this side of the Atlantic:—

For President — Democratic, James Buchanan, Pennsylvania; Republican, John C. Fremont, California; Know-Nothing, Millard Fillmore, New York; Know-Nothing Bolters, N. P. Banks, jun., Massachusetts; Know-Nothing Sub-Bolters, R. F. Stockton, New Jersey; Abolition, Gerrit Smith, New York. For Vice-President — J. C. Breckenridge, Kentucky; W. L. Deyton, New Jersey; A. J. Donelson, Tennessee; W. F. Johnston, Penn-

sylvania; Kenneth Raynor, North Carolina; S. M'Farland, Pennsylvania.

Amongst these, however, the real contest lay between Mr. Buchanan and Colonel Fremont. Mr. Buchanan represented the Democratic or extreme Liberal Party, supported by the Southern Slave-holding States, to a man, who strained every nerve to return a candidate pledged in favour of slavery; and Colonel Fremont represented the Republican or Conservative Party. The question of slavery—the canker-worm of American politics—had become much embittered by the contest which was raging in Kansas, where two parties were at open war, and shedding each other's blood in murderous conflicts to determine whether the territory should be a slave-holding or a free-soil State.

Mr. Buchanan, who was formerly the American Minister at the Court of London, had been proposed by the Democratic National Convention held at Cincinnati, and in a letter which he published to announce his acceptance of the nomination he thus expounded his political views:—

“In the first place, I cordially concur in the sentiments expressed by the Convention on the subject of civil and religious liberty. No party founded on religious or political intolerance towards one class of American citizens, whether born in our own or in a foreign land, can long continue to exist in this country. We are all equal before God and the Constitution; and the dark spirit of despotism and bigotry, which would create odious distinctions among our fellow-citizens, will be speedily rebuked by a free and enlightened public opinion.

“The agitation on the question of domestic slavery has too long distracted and divided the people of this Union, and alienated their affections from each other. This agitation has assumed many forms since its commencement, but it now seems to be directed chiefly to the territories, and, judging from its present character, I think we may safely anticipate that it is rapidly approaching a ‘finality.’ The recent legislation of Congress respecting domestic slavery, derived, as it has been, from the original and pure fountain of legitimate political power, the will of the majority, promises ere long to allay the dangerous excitement. This legislation is founded upon principles as ancient as free government itself, and, in accordance with them, has simply declared that the people of a territory, like those of a State, shall decide for themselves whether slavery shall or shall not exist within their limits.

“The Nebranska Kansas Act does no more than give the force of law to this elementary principle of self-government, declaring it to be ‘the true intent and meaning of this Act not to legislate slavery into any territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom; but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States.’ This principle will surely not be controverted by any individual of any party professing devotion to popular government. Besides, how vain and illusory would any other principle prove in practice in regard to the territories! This is apparent from the fact, admitted by all, that after a territory shall have entered the

Union, and become a State, no constitutional power would then exist which could prevent it from either abolishing or establishing slavery, as the case may be, according to its sovereign will and pleasure.

“May we not hope that it is the mission of the Democratic party, now the only surviving Conservative party of the country, ere long to overthrow all sectional parties, and restore the peace, friendship, and mutual confidence which prevailed in the good old time among the different members of the confederacy? Its character is strictly national, and it therefore asserts no principle for the guidance of the federal government which is not adopted and sustained by its members in each and every State. For this reason it is everywhere the same determined foe of all geographical parties, so much and so justly dreaded by the Father of his Country. From its very nature it must continue to exist so long as there is a Constitution and a Union to preserve. A conviction of these truths has induced many of the purest, the ablest, and most independent of our former opponents, who have differed from us in times gone by upon old and extinct party issues, to come into our ranks and devote themselves with us to the cause of the Constitution and the Union. Under these circumstances I most cheerfully pledge myself, should the nomination of the Convention be ratified by the people, that all the power and influence constitutionally possessed by the Executive shall be exerted in a firm but conciliatory spirit, during the single term I shall remain in office, to restore the same harmony among the sister States which prevailed be-

fore this apple of discord, in the form of slavery agitation, had been cast into their midst. Let the members of the family abstain from intermeddling with the exclusive domestic concerns of each other, and cordially unite, on the basis of perfect equality among themselves, in promoting the great national objects of common interest to all, and the good work will be instantly accomplished."

In regard to foreign policy, he excused himself from entering into particulars, but said, he thought it ought to be based upon the principle of doing justice to all nations and requiring justice from them in return. He added,—

"Should I be placed in the Executive chair, I shall use my best exertions to cultivate peace and friendship with all nations, believing this to be our highest policy as well as our most imperative duty; but at the same time I shall never forget that in case the necessity should arise, which I do not now apprehend, our national rights and national honour must be preserved at all hazards and at any sacrifice."

Colonel Fremont, the nominee of the Republican party, was only 43 years of age, but distinguished by a career of most successful enterprise. Holding an appointment in the United States' army, he had, several years before, been sent to explore the passes of the Rocky Mountains, and penetrated into California, the interior of which was then almost wholly unknown. He there, subsequently, purchased a large tract of territory, known by the name of Mariposa, which proved to be rich in gold ore, and he thus became one of the wealthiest subjects of the Union. Settling in California, he

exerted himself successfully there to obtain a Constitution for that State, excluding slavery, and he was returned as its first Senator, after it had been admitted as a member of the Federation.

The manifesto of the Republican party made the following declaration of its politics. It stated that it was in favour of preserving the Union: it denied the authority of Congress or a territorial Legislature to give legal assistance to slavery in any territory of the United States. It affirmed the power of Congress to prohibit slavery and polygamy within the territories: it pronounced in favour of Kansas being admitted into the Union as a free-soil State; and declared that the highwayman's plea that "might makes right," embodied in the Ostend circular, was in every respect unworthy of American diplomacy, and would bring shame and dishonour upon any government or people that gave it their sanction.

The election of President took place on the 4th of November, when the following votes were given by the Electoral College:*

Mr. Buchanan . . . 163

Colonel Fremont . . 126

Mr. Fillmore . . . 8

—so that Mr. Buchanan became President-Elect of the United States, and will enter upon the duties of his office in the month of March, next year.

A strong step was taken this

* For Mr. Buchanan all the Southern States, except Maryland, voted. These gave him . . . 112 votes.

Free States . . . 51

163

For Colonel Fremont none but Free States voted.

year by the United States' Government in dismissing Mr. Crampton, the British Minister at Washington, and the British Consuls at New York, Philadelphia and Cincinnati, on the ground that they were implicated in attempts to violate the municipal law of the United States by procuring American citizens to enlist in the service of Great Britain during the war with Russia.

The reasons alleged by the United States' Government for this decisive measure were detailed at great length in a dispatch dated the 27th of May, from Mr. Marcy to Mr. Dallas, the American Minister at the British Court. After reviewing the evidence which had been collected with reference to the enlistment of American citizens to serve in the British army in the war against Russia, and endeavouring to prove the complicity of Mr. Crampton and the English Consuls in an infraction of the laws of the United States, Mr. Marcy thus concluded:—

“The gratification which the President feels at the satisfactory settlement of the recruiting question, in so far as respects the action of the British Government itself, has induced him to examine the case again, with the view to remove, if possible, from his mind the personal objections against Her Majesty's Minister and Consuls. The examination has not produced that effect; but, on the contrary, has strengthened his conviction that the interests of both Governments require that those persons should cease to hold their present official positions in the United States. He sincerely regrets that Her Majesty's Government has not been able to take the same view of the case,

and to comply with his request for their recall; but it has not consented to do so.

“If, in the earnest desire to act with all possible courtesy towards Her Majesty's Government, the President could have suspended his determination in the case in order to submit the new testimony, which he is confident would have been found sufficient to induce compliance with his request for the recall of the British Minister, he is precluded from any such thought of delay by the exceptional character of the dispatches of that gentleman, copies of which, having been recently laid before Parliament, have thus come to the knowledge of this Government, and which are of a tenor to render further intercourse between the Governments through that Minister alike unpleasant and detrimental to their good understanding. The President has, therefore, been constrained by considerations of the best interests of both countries reluctantly to have recourse to the only remaining means of removing, without delay, these very unacceptable officers from the connection they now have with this Government.

“This course has been deemed necessary on account of their unfitness for the positions they hold, arising from the very active part they have taken in getting up and carrying out a system of recruiting which has been attended with numerous infractions of our laws, which has disturbed our internal tranquillity, and endangered our peaceful relations to a nation with which this Government is most anxious to maintain cordial friendship and intimate commercial and social intercourse. He has therefore determined to send to Mr.

Crampton, Her Majesty's Diplomatic Representative, his passport, and to revoke the *exequators* of Mr. Matthews, Mr. Barclay, and Mr. Rowecroft, British Consuls at Philadelphia, New York, and Cincinnati."

The annual message of the President was delivered to Congress in December, and the following were the principal contents:—

"Fellow-citizens of the Senate and of the House of Representatives,—The Constitution requires that the President shall, from time to time, not only recommend to the consideration of Congress such measures as he may judge necessary and expedient, but also that he shall give information to them of the state of the Union. To do this fully involves an exposition of all matters in the actual condition of the country, domestic or foreign, which essentially concern the general welfare.

"While performing his constitutional duty in this respect, the President does not speak merely to express personal convictions, but as the Executive Minister of the Government, enabled by his position and called upon by his official obligations to scan with an impartial eye the interests of the whole and of every part of the United States.

"Of the condition of the domestic interests of the Union—its agriculture, mines, manufactures, navigation, and commerce—it is necessary only to say that the internal prosperity of the country, its continuous and steady advancement in wealth and population, and in private as well as public well-being, attest the wisdom of our institutions, and the predomi-

nant spirit of intelligence and patriotism which, notwithstanding occasional irregularities of opinion or action resulting from popular freedom, has distinguished and characterised the people of America.

"In the brief interval between the termination of the last and the commencement of the present session of Congress, the public mind has been occupied with the care of selecting, for another constitutional term, the President and the Vice-President of the United States.

"The determination of the persons who are of right or contingently to preside over the administration of the Government is, under our system, committed to the States and the people. We appeal to them, by their voice pronounced in the forms of law, to call whomsoever they will to the high post of Chief Magistrate.

"And thus it is that, as the Senators represent the respective States of the Union, and the members of the House of Representatives the several constituencies of each State, so the President represents the aggregate population of the United States. Their election of him is the explicit and solemn act of the sole sovereign authority of the Union."

QUESTION OF SLAVERY.—"Perfect liberty of association for political objects and the widest scope of discussion are the received and ordinary conditions of government in our country. Our institutions, framed in the spirit of confidence in the intelligence and integrity of the people, do not forbid citizens, either individually or associated together, to attack by writing, speech, or any other methods short of physical force, the Constitution

and the very existence of the Union.

“Under the shelter of this great liberty, and protected by the laws and usages of the Government they assail, associations have been formed in some of the States, of individuals who, pretending to seek only to prevent the spread of the institution of slavery into the present or future inchoate States of the Union, are really inflamed with a desire to change the domestic institutions of existing States.

“To accomplish their objects, they dedicate themselves to the odious task of depreciating the Government organisation, which stands in their way, and of calumniating with indiscriminate invective not only the citizens of particular States, with whose laws they find fault, but all others of their fellow-citizens throughout the country who do not participate with them in their assaults upon the Constitution framed and adopted by our fathers, and claiming for the privileges it has secured and the blessings it has conferred the steady support and grateful reverence of their children.

“They seek an object which they well know to be a revolutionary one. They are perfectly aware that the change in the relative condition of the white and black races in the slaveholding States which they would promote is beyond their lawful authority; that to them it is a foreign object; that it cannot be effected by any peaceful instrumentality of theirs; that for them and the States of which they are citizens, the only path to its accomplishment is through burning cities, and ravaged fields, and slaughtered populations, and all that is most terrible in foreign

complicated with civil and servile war; and that the first step in the attempt is the forcible disruption of a country embracing in its broad bosom a degree of liberty and an amount of individual and public prosperity to which there is no parallel in history, and substituting in their place hostile governments, driven at once and inevitably into mutual devastation and fratricidal carnage, transforming the now peaceful and felicitous brotherhood into a vast permanent camp of armed men, like the rival monarchies of Europe and Asia.

“In the long series of acts of indirect aggression, the first was the strenuous agitation by citizens of the Northern States, in Congress and out of it, of the question of negro emancipation in the Southern States.

“The second step in this path of evil consisted of acts of the people of the Northern States, and in several instances of their Governments, aimed to facilitate the escape of people held to service in the Southern States, and to prevent their extradition when reclaimed according to law and in virtue of express provisions of the Constitution.

“To promote this object, legislative enactments and other means were adopted to take away or defeat rights which the Constitution solemnly guaranteed. In order to nullify the then existing act of Congress concerning the extradition of fugitives from service, laws were enacted in many States forbidding their officers, under the severest penalties, to participate in the execution of any act of Congress whatever.

“In this way that system of harmonious co-operation between the authorities of the United States

and of the several States for the maintenance of their common institutions, which existed in the early years of the Republic, was destroyed, conflicts of jurisdiction came to be frequent, and Congress found itself compelled for the support of the Constitution and the vindication of its power, to authorise the appointment of new officers charged with the execution of its acts, as if they and the officers of the States were the Ministers respectively of foreign Governments in a state of mutual hostility, rather than fellow-magistrates of a common country, peacefully subsisting under the protection of one well-constituted Union. Thus here also aggression was followed by reaction; and the attacks upon the Constitution at this point did but serve to raise up new barriers for its defence and security.

"The third stage of this unhappy sectional controversy was in connection with the organisation of territorial Governments and the admission of new States into the Union. When it was proposed to admit the State of Maine, by separation of territory from that of Massachusetts, and the State of Missouri, formed of a portion of the territory] ceded by France to the United States, representatives in Congress objected to the admission of the latter, unless with conditions suited to particular views of public policy.

"The imposition of such a condition was successfully resisted. But, at the same period, the question was presented of imposing restrictions upon the residue of the territory ceded by France. That question was for the time disposed of by the adoption of a geographical line of limitation.

"The enactment which esta-

blished the restrictive geographical line was acquiesced in rather than approved by the States of the Union. It stood on the statute-book, however, for a number of years; and the people of the respective States acquiesced in the re-enactment of the principle as applied to the State of Texas; and it was proposed to acquiesce in its further application to the territory acquired by the United States from Mexico.

"But this proposition was successfully resisted by the representatives from the Northern States, who, regardless of the statute line, insisted upon applying restriction to the new territory generally, whether lying north or south of it; thereby repealing it as a legislative compromise, and, on the part of the North, persistently violating the compact, if compact there was.

"Thereupon this enactment ceased to have binding virtue in any sense, whether as respects the North or the South; and so in effect it was treated on the occasion of the admission of the State of California, and the organisation of the territories of New Mexico, Utah, and Washington.

"The several States of the Union are, by force of the Constitution, co-equal in domestic legislative power." Congress cannot change a law of domestic relation in the State of Maine; no more can it in the State of Missouri. Any statute which proposes to do this is a mere nullity; it takes away no right, it confers none. If it remains on the statute-book unrepealed, it remains there only as a monument of error, and a beacon of warning to the legislator and the statesman. To repeal it will be only to remove imperfection from the statutes, without affect-

ing, either in the sense of permission or of prohibition, the action of the States, or of their citizens.

“Still, when the nominal restriction of this nature, already a dead letter in law, was in terms repealed by the last Congress, in a clause of the act organising the territories of Kansas and Nebraska, that repeal was made the occasion of a wide-spread and dangerous agitation.

“It was alleged that the original enactment being a compact of perpetual moral obligation, its repeal constituted an odious breach of faith.

“An act of Congress, while it remains unrepealed, more especially if it be constitutionally valid in the judgment of those public functionaries whose duty it is to pronounce on that point, is undoubtedly binding on the conscience of each good citizen of the Republic. But in what sense can it be asserted that the enactment in question was invested with perpetuity, and entitled to the respect of a solemn compact? Between whom was the compact? No distinct contending powers of the Government, no separate sections of the Union, treating as such, entered into treaty stipulations on the subject.

“It was a mere clause of an act of Congress, and, like any other controverted matter of legislation, received its final shape and was passed by compromise of the conflicting opinions or sentiments of the members of Congress. But if it had moral authority over men’s consciences, to whom did this authority attach? Not to those of the North, who had repeatedly refused to confirm it by extension, and who had zealously striven to establish other and incompatible

regulations upon the subject. And if, as it thus appears, the supposed compact had no obligatory force as to the North, of course it could not have had any as to the South, for all such compacts must be mutual and of reciprocal obligations.

When the acts of some of the States to nullify the existing extradition law imposed upon Congress the duty of passing a new one, the country was invited by agitators to enter into party organisation for its repeal; but that agitation ceased by reason of the impracticability of its object. So, when the statute restriction upon the institutions of new States, by geographical line, had been repealed, the country was urged to demand its restoration, and that project also died almost with its birth. Then followed the cry of alarm from the North against imputed southern encroachments, which cry sprang in reality from the spirit of revolutionary attack on the domestic institutions of the South, and, after a troubled existence of a few months, has been rebuked by the voice of a patriotic people.”

KANSAS.—“Of this last agitation, one lamentable feature was that it was carried on at the immediate expense of the peace and happiness of the people of the territory of Kansas. That was made the battle-field, not so much of opposing factions or interests within itself, as of the conflicting passions of the whole people of the United States. Revolutionary disorder in Kansas had its origin in projects of intervention, deliberately arranged by certain members of that Congress which enacted the law for the organisation of the territory. And when propagandist co-

lonisation of Kansas had thus been undertaken in one section of the Union, for the systematic promotion of its peculiar views of policy, there ensued, as a matter of course, a counteraction with opposite views, in other sections of the Union.

“ In consequence of these and other incidents, many acts of disorder, it is undeniable, have been perpetrated in Kansas, to the occasional interruption, rather than the permanent suspension, of regular government. Aggressive and most reprehensible incursions into the territory were undertaken, both in the North and the South, and entered on its northern border by way of Iowa, as well as on the eastern by way of Missouri; and there has existed within it a state of insurrection against the constituted authorities, not without countenance from inconsiderate persons in each of the great sections of the Union. But the difficulties in that territory have been extravagantly exaggerated, for purposes of political agitation elsewhere.

“ The number and gravity of the acts of violence have been magnified partly by statements entirely untrue, and partly by reiterated accounts of the same rumours or facts. Thus the territory has been seemingly filled with extreme violence, when the whole amount of such acts has not been greater than what occasionally passed before us in single cities, to the regret of all good citizens, but without being regarded as of general or permanent political consequence.

“ Imputed irregularities in the elections in Kansas, like occasional irregularities of the same description in the States, were beyond the sphere of action of the Execu-

tive. But incidents of actual violence or of organised obstruction of law, pertinaciously renewed from time to time, have been met as they occurred by such means as were available, and as the circumstances required; and nothing of this character now remains to affect the general peace of the Union.

“ The attempt of a part of the inhabitants of the territory to erect a revolutionary Government, though sedulously encouraged and supplied with pecuniary aid from active agents of disorder in some of the States, has completely failed. Bodies of armed men, foreign to the territory, have been prevented from entering, or compelled to leave it. Predatory bands, engaged in acts of rapine, under cover of the existing political disturbances, have been arrested or dispersed. And every well-disposed person is now enabled once more to devote himself in peace to the pursuits of prosperous industry, for the prosecution of which he undertook to participate in the settlement of the territory.

“ It affords me unmingled satisfaction thus to announce the peaceable condition of things in Kansas; especially considering the means to which it was necessary to have recourse for the attainment of the end,—namely, the employment of a part of the military force of the United States. The withdrawal of that force from its proper duty of defending the country against foreign foes or the savages of the frontier, to employ it for the suppression of domestic insurrection, is, when the exigency occurs, a matter of the most earnest solicitude.

“ On this occasion of imperative necessity it has been done with

the best results, and my satisfaction in the attainment of such results by such means is greatly enhanced by the consideration that through the wisdom and energy of the present Executive of Kansas, and the prudence, firmness, and vigilance of the military officers on duty there, tranquillity has been restored, without one drop of blood having been shed in its accomplishment, by the forces of the United States.

“ In those parts of the United States where, by reason of the inflamed state of the public mind, false rumours and misrepresentations have the greatest currency, it has been assumed that it was the duty of the Executive, not only to suppress insurrectionary movements in Kansas, but also to see to the regularity of local elections. It needs little argument to show that the President has no power.

“ All government in the United States rests substantially upon popular election. The freedom of elections is liable to be impaired by the intrusion of unlawful votes, or the exclusion of lawful ones, by improper influences, by violence, or by fraud. But the people of the United States are themselves the all-sufficient guardians of their own rights, and to suppose that they will not remedy in due season any such incidents of civil freedom is to suppose them to have ceased to be capable of self-government.

“ The President of the United States has not power to interpose in elections, to see to their freedom, to canvass their votes, or to pass upon their legality in the territories any more than in the States. If he had such power, the Government might be Republican in form, but it would be a Monarchy in fact; and if he had

undertaken to exercise it in the case of Kansas, he would have been justly subject to the charge of usurpation, and of violation of the dearest rights of the people of the United States.”

CUSTOMS. — “ During the last fiscal year the receipts from customs were for the first time more than 64,000,000 dollars, and from all sources 73,918,141 dollars; which, with the balance on hand up to the 1st of July, 1855, made the total resources of the year to amount to 92,850,117 dollars.

“ The expenditures, including 3,000,000 dollars in execution of the treaty with Mexico, and excluding sums paid on account of the public debt, amounted to 60,172,401 dollars, and including the latter to 72,948,792 dollars, the payment on this account having amounted to 12,776,390 dollars.

“ On the 4th of March, 1853, the amount of the public debt was 69,129,937 dollars. There was a subsequent increase of 2,750,000 dollars for the debt of Texas, making a total of 71,879,937 dollars.

“ Of this the sum of 45,525,319 dollars, including premium, has been discharged, reducing the debt to 30,737,129 dollars; all of which might be paid within a year without embarrassing the public service, but being not yet due, and only redeemable at the option of the holder, cannot be pressed to payment by the Government.

“ On examining the expenditure of the last five years it will be seen that the average, deducting payments on account of the public debt and 10,000,000 dollars paid by treaty to Mexico, has been but about 48,000,000 dollars. It is believed that under an economical

administration of the Government the average expenditure for the ensuing five years will not exceed that sum, unless extraordinary occasion for its increase should occur."

ARMY AND NAVY.—"The army during the past year has been so constantly employed against hostile Indians in various quarters that it can scarcely be said with propriety of language to have been a peace establishment.

"Legislation has been recommended by me on previous occasions to cure defects in the existing organisation, and to increase the efficiency of the army, and further observation has but served to confirm me in the views then expressed, and to enforce on my mind the conviction that such measures are not only proper, but necessary.

"I have, in addition, to invite the attention of Congress to a change of policy in the distribution of troops, and to the necessity of providing a more rapid increase of the military armament. For details of these and other subjects relating to the army I refer to the report of the Secretary of War.

"The condition of the navy is not merely satisfactory, but exhibits the most gratifying evidences of increased vigour."

RELATIONS WITH FOREIGN POWERS.—"The United States continue in the enjoyment of amicable relations with all foreign Powers.

"When my last annual message was transmitted to Congress, two subjects of controversy, one relating to the enlistment of soldiers in this country for foreign service, and the other to Central America,

threatened to disturb good understanding between the United States and Great Britain. Of the progress and termination of the former question you were informed at the time, and the other is now in the way of satisfactory adjustment.

"The object of the convention between the United States and Great Britain of the 19th of April, 1850, was to secure, for the benefit of all nations, the neutrality and the common use of any transit way or inter-oceanic communication across the Isthmus of Panama, which might be opened within the limits of Central America. The pretension subsequently asserted by Great Britain to dominion or control over territories in or near two of the routes—those of Nicaragua and Honduras—were deemed by the United States, not merely incompatible with the main object of the treaty, but opposed even to its express stipulations. Occasion of controversy on this point has been removed by an additional treaty which our minister at London has concluded, and which will be immediately submitted to the Senate for its consideration. Should the proposed supplemental arrangement be concurred in by all the parties to be affected by it, the objects contemplated by the original convention will have been fully attained.

"The treaty between the United States and Great Britain of the 5th of June, 1854, which went into effective operation in 1855, put an end to causes of irritation between the two countries by securing to the United States the right of fishery on the coast of the British North American provinces, with advantages equal to those enjoyed by British subjects. Besides the

signal benefits of this treaty to a large class of our citizens engaged in a pursuit connected to no inconsiderable degree with our national prosperity and strength, it has had a favourable effect upon other interests in the provision it made for reciprocal freedom of trade between the United States and the British provinces in America.

“The exports of domestic articles to those provinces during the last year amounted to more than 22,000,000 dollars, exceeding those of the preceding year by nearly 7,000,000 dollars; and the imports therefrom during the same period amounted to more than 21,000,000 dollars, — an increase of 6,000,000 dollars upon those of the previous year.

“The improved condition of this part of our commerce is mainly attributable to the above-mentioned treaty.

“Provision was made in the first article of that treaty for a commission to designate the mouths of rivers to which the common right of fishery on the coast of the United States and the British provinces was not to extend. This commission has been employed a part of two seasons, but without much progress, in accomplishing the object for which it was instituted, in consequence of a serious difference of opinion between the commissioners, not only as to the precise point where the rivers terminate, but in many instances as to what constitutes a river. These difficulties, however, may be overcome by resort to the umpirage provided for by the treaty.

“The efforts perseveringly prosecuted since the commencement of my administration, to relieve

our trade to the Baltic from the exaction of Sound Dues by Denmark, have not yet been attended with success.

“Negotiations entered into for the purpose of relieving our commercial intercourse with the island of Cuba of some of its burdens, and providing for the more speedy settlement of local disputes growing out of that intercourse, have not yet been attended with any results.”

MARITIME LAW. — “Soon after the commencement of the late war in Europe, this Government submitted to the consideration of all maritime nations two principles for the security of neutral commerce; one, that the neutral flag should cover enemies’ goods, except articles contraband of war; and the other, that neutral property on board merchant vessels of belligerents should be exempt from condemnation, with the exception of contraband articles. These were not presented as new rules of international law, having been generally claimed by neutrals, though not always admitted by belligerents. One of the parties to the war—Russia—as well as several neutral Powers, promptly acceded to these propositions, and the two other belligerents, Great Britain and France, having consented to observe them for the present occasion, a favourable opportunity seemed to be presented for obtaining a general recognition of them both in Europe and America.

“But Great Britain and France, in common with most of the States of Europe, while forbearing to reject, did not affirmatively act upon the overtures of the United States.

“While the question was in

this position the representatives of Russia, France, Great Britain, Austria, Prussia, Sardinia, and Turkey, assembled at Paris, took into consideration the subject of maritime rights, and put forth a declaration containing the two principles which this Government had submitted, nearly two years before, to the consideration of maritime Powers, and adding thereto the following propositions: 'Privateering is and remains abolished,' and 'blockades, in order to be binding, must be effective,—that is to say, maintained by a force sufficient really to prevent access to the coast of the enemy,' and to the declaration thus composed of four points, two of which had already been proposed by the United States, this Government has been invited to accede by all the Powers represented at Paris, except Great Britain and Turkey.

"To the last of the two additional propositions—that in relation to blockades—there can certainly be no objection. It is merely the definition of what shall constitute the effectual investment of a blockaded place,—a definition for which this Government has always contended, claiming indemnity for losses where a practical violation of the rule thus defined has been injurious to our commerce. As to the remaining article of the declaration of the Conference of Paris, 'that privateering is and remains abolished,' I certainly cannot ascribe to the Powers represented in the Conference of Paris any but liberal and philanthropic views in the attempt to change the unquestionable rule of maritime law in regard to privateering. Their proposition was doubtless intended to imply

approval of the principle that private property upon the ocean, although it might belong to citizens of a belligerent State, should be exempted from capture; and, had that proposition been so framed as to give full effect to the principle, it would have received my ready assent on behalf of the United States.

"But the measure proposed is inadequate to that purpose. It is true, that if adopted, private property upon the ocean would be withdrawn from one mode of plunder, but left exposed, meanwhile, to another mode, which could be used with increased effectiveness. The aggressive capacity of great naval Powers would be thereby augmented, while the defensive ability of others would be reduced. Though the surrender of the means of prosecuting hostilities by employing privateers, as proposed by the Conference of Paris, is mutual in terms, yet in practical effect it would be the relinquishment of a right of little value to one class of States, but of essential importance to another and larger class. It ought not to have been anticipated that a measure so inadequate to the accomplishment of the proposed object, and so unequal in its operation, would receive the assent of all maritime Powers. Private property would be still left to the depredations of the public armed cruisers.

"I have expressed a readiness on the part of this Government to accede to all the principles contained in the declaration of the Conference of Paris, provided that relating to the abandonment of privateering can be so amended as to effect the object for which, as is presumed, it was intended—the immunity of private property on

the ocean from hostile capture. To effect this object, it is proposed to add to the declaration, that 'privateering is and remains abolished,' the following amendment—'And that the private property of subjects and citizens of a belligerent on the high seas shall be exempt from seizure by the public armed vessels of the other belligerent, except it be contraband.' This amendment has been presented not only to the Powers which have asked our assent to the declaration to abolish privateering, but to all other maritime States. Thus far it has not been rejected by any, and is favourably entertained by all who have made any communication in reply.

"Several of the Governments, regarding with favour the proposition of the United States, have delayed definitive action upon it only for the purpose of consulting with other parties to the Conference of Paris. I have the satisfaction of stating, however, that the Emperor of Russia has entirely and explicitly approved that modification, and will co-operate in endeavouring to obtain the assent of other Powers; and that assurances of a similar purport have been received in relation to the disposition of the Emperor of the French.

"The present aspect of this important subject allows us to cherish the hope that a principle so humane in its character, so just and equal in its operation, so essential to the prosperity of commercial nations, and so consonant to the sentiments of this enlightened period of the world, will command the approbation of all maritime Powers, and thus be incorporated into the code of international law."

NICARAGUA.—"The peculiar condition of affairs in Nicaragua in the early part of the present year rendered it important that this Government should have diplomatic relations with that State. Through its territory had been opened one of the principal thoroughfares across the Isthmus, connecting North and South America, on which a vast amount of property was transported, and to which our citizens resorted in great numbers in passing between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of the United States. The protection of both required that the existing power in that State should be regarded as a responsible Government; and its minister was accordingly received. But he remained here only a short time. Soon thereafter the political affairs of Nicaragua underwent unfavourable change, and became involved in much uncertainty and confusion. Diplomatic representatives from two contending parties have been recently sent to this Government; but, with the imperfect information possessed, it was not possible to decide which was the Government *de facto*; and, awaiting further developments, I have refused to receive either."

ISTHMUS OF PANAMA.—"The present condition of the Isthmus of Panama, in so far as regards the security of persons and property passing over it, requires serious consideration. Recent incidents tend to show that the local authorities cannot be relied on to maintain the public peace of Panama, and there is just ground for apprehension that a portion of the inhabitants are meditating further outrages, without adequate measures for the security and protection of persons or property having

been taken, either by the State of Panama, or by the general Government of New Granada.

“Under the guarantees of treaty, citizens of the United States have, by the outlay of several millions of dollars, constructed a railroad across the Isthmus, and it has become the main route between our Atlantic and Pacific possessions, over which multitudes of our citizens and a vast amount of property are constantly passing, to the security and protection of all which, and the continuance of the public advantages involved, it is impossible for the Government of the United States to be indifferent.

“I have deemed the danger of the recurrence of scenes of lawless violence in this quarter so imminent as to make it my duty to station a part of our naval force in the harbours of Panama and Aspinwall, in order to protect the persons and property of the citizens of the United States in those ports, and to insure to them safe passage across the Isthmus. And it would, in my judgment, be unwise to withdraw the naval force now in those ports until, by the spontaneous action of the Republic of New Granada, or otherwise, some adequate arrangement shall have been made for the protection and security of a line of inter-oceanic communication so important at this time, not to the United States only, but to all other maritime States both of Europe and America.

“Meanwhile negotiations have been instituted by means of a special commission to obtain from New Granada full indemnity for injuries sustained by our citizens on the Isthmus, and satisfactory security for the general interests of the United States.”

CONCLUSION. — “In addressing to you my last annual message, the occasion seems to me an appropriate one to express my congratulations in view of the peace, greatness, and felicity which the United States now possess and enjoy. To point out to you the state of the various departments of the Government and of all the great branches of the public service, civil and military, in order to speak of the intelligence and the integrity which pervade the whole, would be to indicate but imperfectly the administrative condition of the country, and the beneficial effects of that on the general welfare. Nor would it suffice to say that the nation is actually at peace at home and abroad, that its industrial interests are prosperous, that the canvas of its mariners whitens every sea, and the plough of the husbandman is marching steadily onward to the bloodless conquest of the continent; that cities and populous States are springing up, as if by enchantment, from the bosom of our western wilds, and that the courageous energy of our people is making these United States the great republic of the world.

“These results have not been attained without passing through trials and perils, by experience of which—and such only—nations can harden into manhood. Our forefathers were trained to the wisdom which conceived and the courage which achieved the independence by circumstances which surrounded them, and they were thus made capable of the creation of the Republic. It devolved on the next generation to consolidate the work of the revolution, to deliver the country entirely from the influence of conflicting Trans-

lantic partialities or antipathies which attached to our colonial and revolutionary history, and to organise the practical operation of the constitutional and legal institutions of the Union.

“ To us of this generation remains the not less noble task of maintaining and extending the power of the United States. We have at length reached that stage of the national career in which the dangers to be encountered and the exertions to be made are the incidents, not of weakness, but of strength. In our foreign relations we have to attemper our power to the less happy condition of other republics in America, and to place ourselves, in the calmness and conscious dignity of right, by the side of the greatest and wealthiest of the empires of Europe. In our domestic relations we have to guard against the shock of the discontents, the ambi-

terests, and the exuberant and therefore sometimes irregular impulses of opinion or of action, which are the natural product of the present political elevation, the self-reliance, and the restless spirit of enterprise of the people of the United States.

“ I shall prepare to surrender the executive trust to my successor, and to retire into private life with sentiments of profound gratitude to the good Providence which, during the period of my administration, has vouchsafed to carry through many difficulties, domestic and foreign, and to enable me to contemplate the spectacle of amicable and respectful relations between our and all other Governments, and the establishment of constitutional order and tranquility throughout the Union.

“ FRANKLIN PIERCE.

“ Washington, Dec. 2, 1856.”

CHRONICLE.

CHRONICLE.

JANUARY, 1856.

THE WEATHER.—Although the weather in the last six weeks of 1855 seemed to predict a severe winter, a great change took place at the commencement of the year, and the season may be said to have been mild. In January and February frequent alternations of excess and deficiency occurred; but, on the whole, there was an excess of heat over the average of $3\frac{1}{2}$ degrees. The air contained moisture above the average. In March, on the other hand, both the temperature and moisture were in defect. In January, the barometer was low; in February and March high. Fogs and rain were very prevalent throughout January and March.

8. **LAUNCH OF THE PERSIA, MAIL STEAMER.**—A magnificent iron paddle-wheel steam-ship, the *Persia*, built by Napier and Sons, of Glasgow, for the Cunard Company, made her trial trip. This ship will be the largest steam-ship afloat in the world—until another shall have been built which shall surpass her. Such have been the advances made in our ideas of ships, and especially of steam-ships of late years, that the giant of to-day is the pigmy of to-morrow; and the chief use of these records is to show what was a magnificent ship at the commence-

ment of 1856. The *Persia* is built of iron; her dimensions are:

Length from figurehead to taffrail	390 feet.
Length in the water . . .	360 „
Breadth of the hull . . .	45 „
Breadth over all . . .	71 „
Depth	32 „
Burden	3600 tons.
Diameter of paddlewheels . .	40 feet.

By the Government rule of measure, her steam-power would be equal to 900 horses; according to Watt's mode of reckoning, it would be equal to 4000 horses, at least. The ship is of beautiful model, and combined so as to secure the greatest mechanical strength. Her keel-plates are of sheet-iron, 11-16ths of an inch thick; the bottom plates 15-16ths; up to the water-line, 11-16ths. She is divided into seven water-tight compartments; besides which she has, in effect, a double bottom. She has two engines and eight boilers. She will afford separate and roomy accommodation for 260 passengers; and will carry a crew of 150 men. Besides splendid saloons, and all other requisite apartments for her passengers, she has a bakery, butcher's shambles, scullery, cow-house, carpenter's shop, doctor's shop, ice-houses, bath-rooms, and twenty water-closets. The builders' calculations as to her speed were

not disappointed, for, on her voyage round from Glasgow to Liverpool, she made an average of more than 16 knots, or 19 miles an hour.

8. AT THE CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT.—Edward Harvey, 31, and Harriett Ray, 33, were indicted for the wilful murder of Harriett Harvey, by starving her to death.

The male prisoner was a widower with four children—the deceased, who was about five years old, an older girl, one of ten years and a half, and a boy, about three years old. The woman, it appeared, had cohabited with him for about eight months, and they passed as man and wife. In the month of December the whole family occupied one room in Brunswick Street, Hackney, and there appeared to be no doubt that they were in a most miserable and destitute condition. On the morning of the 23rd of December, the male prisoner went to the landlady of the house, and told her that two of his children were dying, and she gave him the address of Mr. Vinnall, the medical officer for the district; he proceeded there, and that gentleman accompanied him back to his lodging, where he found the deceased girl lying dead upon a miserable mattress, and another child, William, in a dying state, and he expired shortly afterwards. The children presented a most dreadfully emaciated appearance, and the only food that was seen was a small quantity of rice and oatmeal; but the female prisoner said that the children had eaten a hearty supper on the previous night. Upon a *post mortem* examination of the deceased children, not a vestige of food of any kind was found in the stomach, and every portion of fat had been absorbed; and Dr. Letheby, the emi-

nent professor of chymistry, who was called upon to examine and analyse the intestines and stomach, expressed his opinion that the deaths were the result of a long-continued course of deprivation of nourishment. It should be stated that in the stomach of both the deceased there were found some small pieces of wood, which they had no doubt devoured in the extremity of their hunger. In order to establish the charge against the prisoners, evidence was adduced to show that in July last, the male prisoner was committed to prison from Worship Street, for ill-using and deserting the children; and when they were afterwards delivered up to him, they were healthy and in good condition, and it was proved that very soon afterwards they appeared very emaciated and in a most miserable state, and that the deceased child, Harriett, upon several occasions, had been seen to pick up offal in the street and eat it ravenously. It was also proved that the prisoner had received assistance from the parish, in the shape of food, and that an order was given him for work, at which he could have earned 10s. or 12s. per week, but that he would not avail himself of it. It likewise appeared that the prisoner had been employed at his trade of a bricklayer, in October, and shortly before the deaths of the children, and that he received between 5*l.* and 6*l.* for wages, out of which sum, however, he had to pay a man who assisted him.

The prisoners, when called upon for their defence, declared that they had done all in their power for the children, and that they had the whole of the food they were able to obtain.

The jury found the male pri-

soner guilty of manslaughter, and acquitted the woman.

9. DOUBLE CHILD-MURDER AT HOXTON.—*At the Central Criminal Court.* — Mary M'Neill, 25, described as a spinster, was charged with the wilful murder of George M'Neill, her son.

There was a second indictment, charging her with the murder of another of her children, named Edwin M'Neill.

The prisoner pleaded "Not Guilty" to both charges.

The first indictment was proceeded with.

Mr. Bodkin, counsel for the prosecution, said that, although the prisoner was charged with the crime of wilful murder upon the person of one of her children, it would be impossible to conceal from them the fact that the prisoner had in reality destroyed two of her children, by cutting their throats. Of this fact, the evidence would, he believed, leave no possible doubt, and the only question that would arise in the case, was whether the prisoner, at the time the act was committed, was in a state of mind to render her criminally responsible.

Henry Charles Pickering : — I resided at No. 17, Murray Street, Hoxton, in November last. The prisoner was the landlady of the house, and occupied the lower part of it. She had three children, and the eldest was the deceased, George M'Neill. On the 29th of November I saw the deceased alive for the last time. About 11 o'clock at night, the prisoner came into the kitchen and I saw no more of her that night. On the following morning, as I was going down stairs, I saw a cash-box and a gown-piece lying on the staircase. I knocked at the prisoner's door,

and asked if she was up, and she replied, "Oh, what have I done? —oh, what have I done?" I at first thought she alluded to her leaving the cash-box on the stairs, and I pushed the door open and went into the room, and there saw the baby lying on the bed with its throat cut. The prisoner had hid herself behind the door, and I did not see her. I gave an alarm, and in a short time a policeman came, and I told him what had happened, and he went into the prisoner's room, and I there saw two children lying dead. The third child had been taken into the country about a month before. I observed a razor lying upon the bed, and I found it was one that belonged to me, and which I kept in a box in the kitchen, that was locked, and I saw a key taken out of the prisoner's room that fitted the box. Some one had meddled with my razors a short time before. It was taken twice out of the case during a fortnight, and put in the wrong way, and I complained of it to the prisoner, and also asked the children whether they had been to the drawer, and they all denied having done so, or that they had meddled with the razors. I then said that I would have a lock put upon the drawer. The prisoner seemed to be well off, and to be amply provided with clothes and all other necessities. She seemed to be very happy and comfortable until a short time before the children were killed, and I then observed that a change took place in her appearance. She became very melancholy, and was frequently moaning over her children. I knew of no cause for her becoming unhappy, but the change was very marked in her. I have heard her complain that her children had no clothes to go out in.

This was not the fact. The children had very good clothes indeed.

Eleanor Pickering:—I am the wife of the last witness. I observed a great change in the prisoner's demeanour after her last child was born, and I believe she had the milk fever. She frequently told me that her children had no clothes to wear, and she appeared very unhappy and low-spirited. The third child was sent into the country in consequence of my having observed the prisoner hold him over the balusters, and exclaim, "I'll drop him, I'll drop him!" My husband mentioned this to her friends, and the child was sent away in consequence.

Mr. Gibson, surgeon to the gaol of Newgate, said, that from what he had seen of the prisoner, he was of opinion that she was undoubtedly insane at the time she committed the act imputed to her. He was aware that the father of the prisoner was confined in a lunatic asylum as an incurable lunatic.

Mr. Ballantine, for the prisoner, said, he felt assured that after the testimony that had been adduced as to the condition of the prisoner's mind at the time she committed this dreadful act, and the additional evidence he should produce, the jury would be fully satisfied that she was in a state of insanity at the time, and was consequently not legally responsible for what she had done.

The mother of the prisoner was then examined, and she gave strong confirmatory evidence as to the condition of the mind of the prisoner, and also stated that her husband, the prisoner's father, was at present in an asylum as an incurable lunatic.

Mr. Amsden, surgeon, who had

attended the prisoner after the birth of her last child, proved that she had milk fever, and that her mind was considerably affected after that event.

The jury, without hesitation, returned a verdict of "Not Guilty," on the ground of insanity.

The prisoner was ordered to be detained during Her Majesty's pleasure.

9. DOUBLE CHILD MURDER.—*At the Central Criminal Court.*—Sarah Allen, 33, a married woman, was indicted for the wilful murder of two of her children by drowning them.

Mr. Bodkin, the counsel for the Crown, after stating that there could be no doubt that the unhappy woman had caused the death of her children, said that there would be no doubt that the prisoner had been labouring under some extraordinary delusions with regard to the children, and that the act was probably committed while she was under the influence of that delusion. It appeared to him, therefore, that the only question the jury would have to decide would be whether at the time the prisoner destroyed the lives of her children, she was in such a state of mind as to render her responsible.

Mrs. Elizabeth Woodland said, —In November last I was a lodger in the house of the prisoner and her husband, in Portland Terrace, Chelsea. They had three children. The deceased (the child whose death was charged in the first indictment) was the eldest child. He was six years old. The youngest child was about eleven months old. All the children were boys. I remember the 15th of November. It was a very foggy day. The prisoner went out with her

three children about half-past 5 o'clock in the evening. I said to her, "Are you going out this foggy night with those children?" and she replied, "Yes; I am only going on a little errand." The prisoner's husband came home about a quarter to 6 o'clock, but at 12 o'clock at night the prisoner had not returned.

Cross-examined.—The prisoner and her husband lived on very good terms, and she always appeared very affectionate to her children. In their station in life they had a very happy home. I know the prisoner had an opinion that her children were scrofulous. I had a book on the subject of scrofula and king's evil, and the prisoner borrowed it of me to read. The children were very clean-looking and healthy, and did not present the least appearance of scrofula. I frequently heard the prisoner say that her son Willy looked very ill, and that he had scrofula in his blood. I considered this was an entire delusion, and I endeavoured to remove it from her mind, but I could not do so. She always said that I was wrong and she was sure she was right. Upon other subjects the prisoner was a sensible, intelligent woman.

John Maizey said,—I reside at Chelsea. I remember the night in which the children were taken out of the water. About 5 o'clock I was near Cheyne Walk, and met the prisoner coming along Church Street, which is about 120 yards from the river. She had her three children with her, one on each side and one in her arms. I knew the prisoner, and as she passed me she said it was a very foggy night, and I replied, "Indeed it is." The prisoner then walked on in the direction of the river.

Evidence was then given by watermen, that on the night of the 15th November, the cries of children were heard from the water; that they got into boats and picked up two children, but the third, the deceased, was seen to drift away, and the body was found on the 18th, near Vauxhall Bridge. One of the children taken from the water by the watermen was dead. The children who were drowned were the two eldest.

Mrs. Woodland was here recalled, and she said that last June the prisoner complained very much of her head, and she used to cut her arm and say that powder came out of it, and that was the disease.

Mrs. Richards said, — I have known the prisoner a long time. She came to my residence, in Cirencester Place, Fitzroy Square, on the evening of the occurrence. It was about 7 o'clock when she came. She was alone, and appeared to be very desponding and in great distress. I hardly knew her at first. She said that she wished to speak to me, and then she added, "I have lost my children." She was crying. She said nothing of what had taken place. Witness could not persuade her to go home before 2 o'clock in the morning. Witness went home with her. She took up the body of the dead child, which was lying on the bed, and kissed it. She inquired very eagerly and many times for her baby. The prisoner appeared in an agony of grief when she came to my house, and I never saw her in such a state before. The prisoner and her husband lived very affectionately together, and the prisoner was a very good wife, and appeared passionately fond of her children, and was, if anything, too indulgent to them. I know of the

delusion she entertained respecting her children being scrofulous. It was no use reasoning with her. She would say, "My husband is ruined, my children are ruined—we are a ruined family." A relation of the prisoner died in a lunatic asylum. The prisoner fancied not only that her children were scrofulous, but that she and her husband were also suffering from the disease.

Mr. Tibbett, surgeon, deposed that he had been in the habit of attending the prisoner and her children, and she frequently expressed a fear that her children were suffering from some impure disease. He examined the children, but could trace no foundation for the statement, and he told the prisoner so; but it did not appear to alter her opinion, and she said they would have to suffer for some years, and die, and she would rather they should die than live and suffer. He considered that it was an entire delusion on the part of the prisoner.

In answer to the prisoner's counsel, Mr. Tibbett said, that supposing the prisoner to have committed the act with which she was charged, he considered it very possible that she committed it under the influence of the delusion that she was doing her children a kindness by saving them from misery and disease.

Dr. Rowe, and Mr. Gibson, the surgeon of Newgate, agreed in the existence of the delusion, which was likely to lead to the commission of such an act; and the latter gave his opinion that, at the time the prisoner threw her children into the water, she was incapable of distinguishing right from wrong.

The jury immediately returned

a verdict of "Not Guilty," upon the ground of insanity.

The learned Judge gave directions that the prisoner should be detained during Her Majesty's pleasure.

11. DESTRUCTION OF PIRATES IN THE CHINESE SEAS.—The *Gazette* of this day contains despatches from our officers on the Chinese coast, narrating the destruction of large fleets of pirates which hung about our settlement at Hong Kong, and committed great atrocities on the native trading craft. Commander Fellowes, of Her Majesty's sloop *Rattler*, narrates how, on the 28th of May, at Sanchow, the boats of his ship burnt six and brought off five piratical junks, carrying from eight to fourteen guns, some of which were 24, 18, and 12 pounders. On the 6th June, he destroyed two large junks near the Ladrone Islands. On the 4th August, the boats of the *Rattler* and the *Powhattan*, a United States steam-ship of war, towed by a small steamer, came upon a piratical fleet at Kulan. This was a regularly organised piratical squadron, commanded by a chief of great ability. His squadron consisted of 34 junks, some of them very large. Five were evidently built expressly for war purposes, and carried a heavy armament. One had 21 guns mounted. There were on board one of the captured ships one 68-pounder, and one 18-pounder, weighing 50 cwt.: besides 32's., 24's., 12's., and 6's. These vessels carried an ample supply of small arms and hand arms, stink-pots, &c. As the boats approached, the smaller vessels were sent into shallower water, and the crews of the large junks opened a close and well directed fire, standing to their

guns with admirable firmness. But the rockets, shell, and grape from the European boats committed fearful havoc upon their crowded ranks, and of 1000 men supposed to be on board these vessels, it is computed that one-half were slain; while of the conquerors, three English and two Americans were killed; and eighteen wounded (of whom three Americans mortally). Nine war-junks, carrying 130 guns, were captured and burnt.

Commander Vansittart, of Her Majesty's sloop *Bittern*, narrates his proceedings against the pirates in the Gulf of Leotung. The attack upon the pirates was, in this instance, at least, countenanced and directed by the Chinese authorities; for complaints having been received that a vast piratical fleet, including *two European vessels, and having Europeans on board*, was cruising in the gulf, the *Bittern* and boats, towed by the *Confucius*, a private steamer, apparently, armed and manned from the American frigate, and having on board the necessary officials, pilots, and informers, supplied by the Chinese Government, set out in search of them. The villains, 30 to 40 in number, were discovered in a deep bight of the gulf; and their audacity was such, that far from waiting for the attack, they bore down, in pretty style, upon our ships and boats in two divisions; and when they had our expedition at advantage, joined their two lines, and took up a position in which, while they gave us the full effect of their fire, our ships could only reply by "yawing up." Their fire, also, was so good and so steady, that Commander Vansittart is of opinion that it was the fact that they had Europeans,

and clever ones, on board. Although our squadron was successful—for they burnt or sunk eight of the largest—yet the pirates' force was too strong and too well commanded to be dealt with as other barbarian squadrons had been; for Commander Vansittart admits, that "he was glad to heave aback, and work out of the dangerous corner into which they had led them, without taking possession of any of their vessels." By the defeat of the pirates, however, a vast number of trading vessels were released from blockade. These scoundrels, thus disappointed of a handsome booty—for they extorted 1200 dollars from every vessel they permitted to pass—having captured a mandarin of low rank, cut him into quarters, which they sent ashore in a basket to the authorities, with a message, that unless 100,000 dollars were paid forthwith, they would serve all the mandarins in a similar manner. It would seem that they received their blackmail. A few days later, our expedition fell in with 14 pirate junks, of which 11 were captured and burnt. It seems certain that two Europeans, one a Portuguese, were on board this fleet, but had escaped to the hills when our boats came in sight. This would infer that the inhabitants of the coast are in league with the pirates. Although the vessels composing this fleet were not so large as those encountered by Commander Fellowes—carrying only from 6 to 14 guns—they seem to have been of a superior description and organisation. There were a few heavy guns, but their favourite armament seemed to be "a nice sort of medium 18." That they would not hesitate to attack any merchantman may be inferred

from their bearing down with such spirit upon men-of-war; and that this step was not the result of necessity may be inferred from the circumstance, that many of them could out-sail the *Bittern*, and, in calm weather, all could sweep at the rate of three or four knots.

At the beginning of October, Commander Vansittart received information that a strong piratical squadron had blockaded the island of Potoo, in which were some English ladies, and had actually captured a passenger boat in which were some European gentlemen. The information proved true; and the *Bittern*, with the assistance of a merchant steamer, the *Pavushun*, went to the rescue. The expedition found the pirates in a favourite haunt—the beautiful and secure harbour of Sheipoo. They displayed a gay array of banners, and had taken up an excellent defensive position, off the village of Sheipoo, with crowded decks, and men at their guns, pointed for the passage.

The ships and boats went in boldly to the attack, and their boldness secured their success; for the pirates had lashed their ships stem and stern, in such a line that their left wing was sufficiently advanced to cross the fire of the main body; but by the boldness of our men, our boats were advanced *within* their range. The pirates kept up their fire with astonishing spirit for some time, and it took more than an hour to silence them altogether. Of the whole line of 22 junks, one only was capable of being carried off. She had 11 guns, which had evidently been well served. The largest carried 14 guns; but being marked, she was sunk early in the action, chiefly by the capital gunnery of a young seaman, named

Matless. The whole of the prizes, save the one mentioned, were burnt. The skill and coolness of the pirates may be conceived, from the arrangement which had saved the single junk from destruction. A captured merchant vessel, laden with mud and coals, and having a double tier of cotton bales on her deck, had been sunk outside her, so as just to allow her guns to be fired over her. The effect was to intercept all our balls and shot. About 100 guns, from 18's. downwards, were brought away, and as many were destroyed or sunk. A great number of the pirates who gained the shore were destroyed by the inhabitants; but a large band collected, which was the terror of the island, and a force was therefore landed, which soon overpowered them; the report does not say what became of them. The village, being suspected of piracy—for many sea relics, anchors, &c., were discovered, which proved the inhabitants to have been very successful in *finding* European vessels—was disarmed. The only person killed on our side, was the master of the *Bittern*, Mr. Turner, a very excellent officer, whose entrails were torn out by a round shot, while commanding the *Pavushun*; 15 were wounded, of whom three lost their legs; seven were disabled by the heat on shore, of whom one died. Commanders Vansittart and Fellowes received post rank for their gallantry in these affairs; Lieutenant Brooker, of the *Bittern*, was made commander; and other officers of lower rank were advanced.

14. FATAL BOILER EXPLOSION.—An explosion of a boiler, by which four persons, at least, lost their lives, and fifteen persons were more or less injured, occurred at the ex-

tensive ironworks of Messrs. Hickman, at Lea Brook, Tipton, Staffordshire.

There were five boilers on the premises. At an early hour on Monday, one of the engineers got up the steam in the two boilers, so as to enable a portion of the mill and forge to commence work. About 8 o'clock, just as the puddlers were ready to draw their first heat of iron out of the puddling furnace, one of the boilers exploded with a fearful noise, and carried away a large portion of the roof by which it was covered. The greater part of the boiler was blown an immense height into the air, and, in its descent, struck two puddling furnaces, broke in the roof at the far side of the works, and scattered bricks and tiles in all directions for a distance of from 150 to 200 yards. Both ends of the boiler were blown out, and the fragments broke a high-pressure engine of 20-horse power, and killed three men who were at work in the mill instantly. A man in the employ of Messrs. Bagnall, whose works adjoin, was also killed; several other men in their employ were wounded; some boatmen, on the adjoining canal, were injured. Numerous persons on Messrs. Hickman's premises were hurt, or scalded by the steam and boiling water. In all, fifteen persons were injured, more or less severely. The adjoining premises were greatly damaged, and their inmates had narrow escapes.

16. SHOCKING MURDER OF MR. WAUGH.—While the community was still agitated by the fearful disclosures elicited by the inquiries into Palmer's crimes, they were still further excited by the shooting down of a most respectable gentleman, in the open street, and

in broad daylight. As Mr. George Waugh, attorney and solicitor, and senior partner in the well-known firm of Waugh and Mitchell, 5, Great James Street, Bedford Row, was proceeding from his country residence to his house of business about half-past 10 A.M., and had just crossed over from Hand Court to Bedford Row, a man was seen to step up to him, place a pistol to his left breast, and shoot him dead!

Mr. Becker, of Stationers' Hall Court, made the following statement before the coroner:—This day, about half-past 10 o'clock, I was proceeding along Bedford Street, Bedford Row. I saw a gentleman before me, and he was about to turn down Hand Court. I then saw the prisoner run across the road—that is to say, he came from Hand Court towards Mr. Waugh, the deceased. The prisoner lifted up his hand, and I immediately saw a flash and heard a report. That report proceeded from the weapon the prisoner had in his hand. Mr. Waugh bounded up about a foot in the air, and fell on the ground, breaking his hat in the fall. A gentleman then came up and took hold of the prisoner's arm. Before that, I should mention, the prisoner threw a pistol on the ground. Another pistol was also given to me, which was cocked, loaded, and had a cap on. Both pistols were brass. I was about 30 feet from the deceased when he fell. I did not hear the deceased say anything.

As the case, besides its atrocity, resulted in a question of great importance, the evidence of the murder and that in defence of the prisoner will be best given by an abstract of the trial, which took place at the Central Criminal Court, on the 7th February. (*See p. 23.*)

The murderer, who was very respectably dressed, and was 25 years of age, is a diminutive and deformed person, having a hump upon his back. He exhibited the most callous indifference to his crime and its consequences, made no attempt to disavow his act, and, on being told that his victim was dead, answered that he intended to kill him.

17. THE PEACE.—A second edition of *The Times*, this morning, startled the public by the announcement that Russia had accepted the terms insisted upon by the Allies. The notice was as follows:—

“ACCEPTANCE OF THE PROPOSITION OF THE ALLIES BY RUSSIA.—We have received the following telegraphic despatch from our Vienna correspondent:—

“‘Vienna, Wednesday, 10 P.M.

“‘Russia has unconditionally accepted the propositions of the Allies.

“‘This is authentic.’”

The intelligence produced a great commotion upon the Stock Exchange. The funds experienced a total range of more than 3 per cent., and the operations were extremely large and numerous from the commencement to the close of business. The opening prices of Consols were $87\frac{3}{8}$ for money and $87\frac{5}{8}$ for the account. A demand for stock soon became observable, and upon the publication of the second edition of *The Times*, a sudden rise occurred, amid the most extraordinary agitation, to $88\frac{1}{2}$ for money, whence there was soon a further movement to $90\frac{1}{4}$, while for the account, bargains were entered into at $90\frac{3}{4}$; the market being supported at this period by intelligence of a rise of more than

4 per cent. on the Paris Bourse. Slight fluctuations occurred from minute to minute as the words of the notice were criticised; but the latest general transactions were at $89\frac{5}{8}$ to $\frac{7}{8}$ for money, and $89\frac{7}{8}$ to $90\frac{1}{8}$ for the 7th of February.

In foreign securities a large amount of business was transacted. Turkish exhibited the principal advance; the operations in the Six and the Four per Cent. Guaranteed Stocks being on a very extensive scale. The Six per Cents. advanced from $82\frac{5}{8}$ to $87\frac{1}{2}$, and then receded to $85\frac{3}{4}$, ultimately leaving off $86\frac{1}{2}$. The extreme range was consequently $4\frac{7}{8}$ per cent., and the rise about $3\frac{3}{4}$.

The French Three per Cents. opened at 67f. 50c., and experienced an immediate improvement of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

In the markets for Russian produce, there was considerable agitation. Tallow, which the previous day had been at 67s. per cwt., receded to 62s. 6d. to 63s.

This rise in Consols was not nearly so great as in previous instances of the announcement of peace: on those occasions, however, there was a vast difference in the point to which prices had first descended. At the peace with France, in 1801, there was an improvement from $59\frac{3}{4}$ to 66, and shortly afterwards to 70. After the treaty of Amiens, in 1802, the movement was from $70\frac{1}{4}$ to 79. On the restoration of the Bourbons, in 1814, it was from $61\frac{1}{2}$ to $70\frac{1}{2}$; and after the Battle of Waterloo it was from $53\frac{7}{8}$ to $59\frac{1}{2}$.

22. DINNER-PARTY POISONED AT DINGWALL.—A very distressing occurrence has taken place at Dingwall. The Provost of that town, Mr. M'Iver, had a party of friends to dinner, consisting, besides the

members of his own family, of the Rev. James Gordon, Roman Catholic priest at Beaulieu; Rev. Angus M'Kenzie, Roman Catholic priest at Eskdale; Mr. Lewis M. M'Kenzie, of Findon Black Isle; Mr. John M'Donald, of Torriden, &c.

After dinner Mr. Gordon complained of a parched mouth, took a drink of water, and retired from the room. Mr. M'Donald was immediately affected with similar symptoms; and soon after both the M'Kenzies and the Provost were taken ill—the symptoms being alike in all. It was clear that they had eaten something poisonous. Medical assistance was instantly procured; but the poison had done its effect upon Mr. Gordon and Mr. A. M'Kenzie, who died after dreadful suffering. Mr. M'Kenzie, of Findon, did not long survive. The Provost and Mr. M'Donald had either not taken so large a quantity of the poison, or the remedies had been sufficient, for they recovered. The other persons of the party were not affected. The cause of this melancholy occurrence was soon discovered. There were in the Provost's garden some plants of the monk's-hood (*Aconitum Napellus*), a deadly poison, said to be a favourite in Scotch gardens for the sake of its flowers. The stalk and leaves of this plant being dead, there is nothing to distinguish the root from that of the horse-radish; and a man-servant, being sent into the garden for some of the latter, to be placed on the table as garnish and sauce to the roast beef, unfortunately dug up a root of monk's-hood, which the cook scraped and served up without detecting the mistake. The gentlemen chose roast beef, and were

immediately taken ill; the Provost probably owed his escape to the circumstance of his performing the duty of carving. The rest of the party partook of mutton.

22. THE ARMY — BOUNTY MONEY.—A very great hardship—some called it a fraud—which has led to infinite dissatisfaction, desertion, and even mutiny, in the army, has been remedied. Hitherto the young candidate for military fame—whether induced by martial ardour, or wheedled by the blandishments of the recruiting sergeant—has been apt to consider the bounty money as a panacea for all disagreeables. Great, therefore, has been his astonishment and disgust, at finding that the whole expense of his military outfit was “stopped” out of this pretended *douceur*. His new masters did not even find him his livery; and, perchance, all that he received did not suffice to clear his beer-score. This deception—for such it undoubtedly was—has been ended by a Royal warrant; and hereafter the recruit will receive in money the actual sum specified as bounty.

“Victoria R.

“Whereas, under our regulations and orders for the army, it is prescribed that a recruit, upon being finally approved, shall receive as bounty a sum of money in cash and necessaries; and whereas it has been represented to us that it will be expedient that the recruit should receive his bounty in cash, and should, on final approval, be supplied with necessaries at the public expense: our will and pleasure is, that on and after the 31st of January, 1856, all recruits enlisting in our army shall receive gratuitously a stock of necessaries from the stores of the Director-

General of Army Clothing, which shall be kept up by the soldier at his own expense, under the present or such other regulations as may be determined upon by one of our principal Secretaries of State and our Commander-in-Chief.

"The articles to be supplied to every soldier who enters our army are detailed in the inclosed statement, which comprises every article of necessaries required for soldiers of all branches of our army.

"Given at our Court at St. James's this 22nd day of January, 1856, in the 19th year of our reign.

"By Her Majesty's Command,
"PANMURE."

"This order to take effect on and after the 31st of January, 1856."

A MAN ROLLED TO DEATH.—A fearful accident has occurred at Aberdare, in Glamorganshire, occasioning the instantaneous death of a young man named Robert Thomas, employed at the Gadlys Ironworks. The unfortunate deceased was engaged in the forge; and the rollers used in the making of bar iron had been changed for a fresh set, and were just started, when the deceased, in attempting to adjust a portion of the machinery, stepped too near; his garments were caught by the revolving machinery, and he was dragged between the rollers and whirled round and round through a space of but a few inches in diameter. Before the machinery could be stopped, he had been carried round at least twenty times, and his remains were so fearfully mangled, as to be almost undistinguishable. The poor fellow was a fine young man about 20 years of age.

THE POLISH LEGION.—Among the signs of the earnestness with which the British Government were about to continue the war, was the formation of a Polish Legion, a measure which, at the commencement of the struggle, had been scrupulously shunned out of deference to Prussia and Austria. The distinguished Polish exile, Count Zamoyski, was entrusted with the formation of the *corps*. The General addressed his countrymen and old companions in arms, in the form of a report to Prince Czartoryski, a circular, in which he informs them that he is charged by the British Government, with the assent of France and of Turkey, to organise a division composed of Poles, bearing the name of the "Polish Division of Cossacks of the Sultan," and destined to receive into its ranks Polish prisoners of war, or others who may quit the Russian army. This division was to be composed of a brigade of infantry of two regiments, of a battalion of foot Chasseurs, and of two regiments of cavalry. A first regiment of cavalry has already been formed, and is now at Varna, and the formation of the first regiment of infantry is far advanced at Scutari.

24. FATAL BOAT ACCIDENT.—Between 9 and 10 o'clock A.M. a shore-boat left Mutton Cove, Devonport, for Her Majesty's ship *Exmouth*, lying in the Sound. She carried twelve persons, of whom four were officers, and four men of the man-of-war, and two tradespeople, and two boatmen. As the boat passed over the bridge of sunken rocks between St. Nicholas Island and Mount Edgcumbe, she was struck by a wave, and sunk. Two men-o'-war's boats were soon at the spot, and saved seven, much

exhausted ; but Surgeon Bateman, the two watermen, and two tradesmen were drowned.

24. DECORATIONS TO FRENCH OFFICERS. — Her Majesty has conferred the distinction of the Most Military Order of the Bath on some of the most distinguished generals of the French army who had fought side by side with our troops in the East. The ceremony of investiture was this day performed at the English Embassy, Lord Cowley representing Her Majesty. Lord Cowley is himself a Grand Cross, and was surrounded by all the military and civil members of the Order then in Paris. The Prince Napoleon, Marshal Vailant, and General Canrobert, upon whom Her Majesty had personally conferred the Grand Cross during her visit to Paris, assisted at the ceremony. The officers decorated on this occasion were : Generals Bosquet and Regnaud de St. Jean d'Angely, who received the Grand Cross of the Order ; Generals Neil, de Martimprey, Mellinet, Dalesme, appointed Knights Commanders ; Generals Espinasse, de Beville, Cler, Maneque, and Colonels Comignan, de Rochebouet, Reille, and others, appointed Companions.

21. WILLIAM PALMER, THE POISONER — FORGERY. — At the sittings at *Nisi Prius*, at Westminster, a cause was tried which placed the utter depravity of William Palmer, then lying in Stafford Gaol, to take his trial for a series of poisonings, in a very striking light. The plaintiff, in *Padwick v. Sarah Palmer*, sued the defendant, who is the mother of William Palmer, upon a bill of exchange for 2000*l.*, drawn by William Palmer upon and ac-

cepted by Sarah Palmer, and endorsed by William Palmer to the plaintiff. The defence was, that the bill was a forgery.

The particular circumstances of the case were, that Mr. Padwick, who is a gentleman of good repute, had been applied to by William Palmer to advance to him 2000*l.* upon his own and his mother's security, in the shape of her acceptance and with his endorsement. Mr. Padwick thought it proper to make some inquiries, both as to the genuineness of the instrument, and the sufficiency of the security. The result was, that a solicitor of Rugeley stated that Mrs. Palmer was worth 50,000*l.*, and that the signature was hers. Upon this information Mr. Padwick advanced the 2000*l.* Palmer subsequently paid 1000*l.* on account ; and gave two cheques for the remainder, which were dishonoured. In consequence, Mr. Padwick, who held a warrant of attorney, issued execution against Palmer, and took his person. While in custody under this writ of execution, the terrible disclosure, implicating Palmer in so many murders, was made, and he was taken from the custody of the sheriff, and detained at the suit of the Crown. Mr. Padwick sought by this action to recover the balance of 1000*l.* from Mrs. Palmer, the acceptor.

The Rugeley solicitor referred to deposed that he believed the signature of the bill to be the writing of the defendant : and the person who had introduced the business to the plaintiff, deposed that he had had similar bills drawn by W. Palmer, and accepted by the defendant, which had been paid by cheques of the latter ; but it ap-

peared that these cheques had been brought by and the bills returned to William Palmer himself.

For the defence, a number of witnesses, solicitors, others of the defendant's sons, the banker's clerks, deposed, that to their belief, the signature was not the defendant's writing. The defendant herself was put into the witness-box, and denied her acceptance, and that she had ever given a cheque for 1000*l.* in favour of William Palmer; but it appeared probable that some such transaction might have taken place in respect of an advance of 5000*l.* she had made to William Palmer on security.

At last, William Palmer, the great criminal, whose misdeeds at this time filled every house in the empire with horror and astonishment, was placed in the box. His appearance created intense interest in a crowded court. His testimony added, if that be possible, to his horrible reputation.

Mr. James.—Take that bill of exchange for 2000*l.* in your hand—is the signature to the drawing and endorsement yours?

Witness.—Yes.

You applied to Mr. Padwick to advance money on that bill?—I did.

Who wrote the acceptance, “Sarah Palmer?”—Ann Palmer.

Who is she?—She is now dead.

Do you mean your wife?—Yes.

Did you see her write it?—Yes.

You may now retire.

The witness then retired, very strongly guarded.

The jury immediately returned a verdict for the defendant.

It was generally supposed that the testimony of this infamous man was deliberately planned with a view to an ultimate effect. If so, it affords another proof how the

meshes spread by the wicked ultimately entangle their own feet. The precaution taken by Palmer to conceal his deeds, and to build up a case which should turn away suspicion or proof, were the very means which ultimately produced the circumstantial evidence which confirmed the evidence in chief into moral certainty; and this further act of infamy produced consequences—so far as any consequences followed from it—the reverse of the wretch's design. It is supposed that Palmer, confident that no conclusive case of murder could be made out against him, proposed to act upon a feeling which has been frequently observed to actuate the minds of juries; namely, that when a case which involves capital punishment is not demonstrably clear, and another indictment is pending against the prisoner which would involve a heavy penalty short of death, the jury shrink from the responsibility of coming to a decision in the capital case, confident that the accused will not escape punishment altogether. A verdict is therefore returned of “Not Guilty,” the prisoner is arraigned for burglary, or some other offence, pleads guilty, and receives sentence under circumstances very favourable to commutation. Some such scheme is supposed to have actuated William Palmer now. He was preparing a case for the jury to fall back upon. But why he should have involved his murdered wife in his own crimes, seem inexplicable; it certainly did not lighten his own guilt that he had forced his wife to share it. But his evidence was received with a shout of indignation—no single person believed other than that it was a new act of

infamy; and the universal feeling was, that a man who could commit an act of such unspeakable infamy, must be capable of committing any other crime.

29. WRECK OF HER MAJESTY'S STEAM-SLOOP POLYPHEMUS.—Her Majesty's steam-sloop *Polyphemus*, 5, Commander Warren, was wrecked on the west coast of Jutland, when the master and fourteen of the men were drowned. The ship had left Hull for the Baltic, and had arrived off the Hanstholm Light on the 29th instant. The weather had been thick, but the officers had no misgiving as to their course. Between 10 and 11 A.M., while the men were at great-gun exercise, the fog came down and surrounded them; and soon after, the ship struck. The paddle-box boats were immediately lowered; but one was instantly swamped and rendered useless; but with the other and by the other boats, anchors and cables were got out. Unfortunately, when returning to the ship this paddle-box boat was struck and swamped, and most of the men therein, including Mr. Herbert, the master, were drowned. The ship became filled with water, and the engines stopped. As the sea was now breaking over her, and it was evident that nothing could be done to save her, Commander Warren took measures to land the remainder of his crew, which he appears to have effected in a most cool and officer-like manner. The spirit-room and magazine were secured, the masts were successively cut away with cool skill, and a hawser was floated ashore by means of the pinnace—for the breakers were too great to allow of her use as a boat—and was secured by Danish coast-guard men, who lined the beach.

The men were then authorised to get themselves on shore by the hawser as they best could; when they were landed, the first lieutenant was ordered to go on shore to take charge of the men, and Commander Warren quitted his ship the last man of all. The shipwrecked mariners were treated in the kindest manner by the Danes, and were forwarded to Hamburg. A court-martial substantially acquitted Commander Warren of blame for the loss of the vessel, though it reprimanded him for certain omissions.

THE INDIAN ARMY—THE MADRAS COMMAND.—The principle asserted in Her Majesty's gracious order of May, 1855, that the officers of the East India Company's service should take rank and precedence with the officers of the royal army in all parts of Her Majesty's dominions, or elsewhere, has been carried out in a step which has been taken in regard to the chief command in the Madras Presidency. Hitherto, although the appointment to the command of the forces in the Presidencies is vested in the Board of Directors, they were restricted in their choice to officers of the Queen's service. Now, however, the Directors have, by the consent of the Crown, appointed Lieutenant-General Sir Patrick Grant, a distinguished officer of their own army, to the command-in-chief of the forces in the Madras Presidency. Thus has been abolished a restriction which must necessarily have been very galling to a noble service, and which might have been of serious detriment to the public weal. Whatever may be the merit of individual officers of the royal army, there could be no reason to suppose that a general of average capacity

and experience must, because he was a royal officer, excel the best officers of the Indian army in military excellence, while it was almost certain that he must be inferior to them in local experience; and should it occur, as it constantly occurs, that there are officers in the Indian army of very eminent capacity, it might have been fatal to our empire, that they must, by a perverse regulation, always serve under an officer chosen from without it.

THE VOLCANO OF HAWAII (Owyhee).—The great volcanic mountain of the island of Owyhee has been for some time in a state of activity. A gentleman writes from the island:—

“Hilo, Saturday, October 13th, 1855.—Hawaii still burns. The great furnace on Mauna Loa is in full blast. For 63 days the molten flood has rolled down the mountain without abatement. Our Hawaiian atmosphere is loaded with smoke and gases, through which the sun shines with dingy and yellow rays. The amount of lava disgorged from this awful magazine is enormous. The higher regions of the mountains are flooded with vast tracts of smoking lava, while the streams which have flowed down the sides of the mountain spread over a surface of several miles in breadth. The main stream, including all its windings, must be more than 50 miles long, with an average breadth of three miles. This is still flowing direct for our bay, and it is supposed to be within ten miles of us. It is eating its way slowly through the deep forest and the dense jungle in our rear, and its terminal must be the sea, unless the great summit fountain ceases to disgorge.”

MISS NIGHTINGALE. — While the military chiefs are receiving the rewards of their exertion, in the shape of orders, crosses, and medals, no official mode exists by which the less obtrusive deeds of peace and charity can be recognised; the gentler sex, in especial, whose sphere has been limited to tending the bed of suffering, to cheering the afflicted and desponding, and teaching resignation and hope to the dying, seem altogether excluded from public reward. Her Majesty has, however, found a means of testifying her admiration of Florence Nightingale, whose presence was as the presence of a better angel to our suffering troops in the East.

The Queen has presented to this young lady a jewel, in the shape of a decoration. The jewel is about two-and-a-half inches in width and three in depth, and bears a general resemblance to the badge of an Order. The field of is white enamel, charged with a St. George's cross, in ruby-red enamel, from which emanate rays of gold. The field is encircled by a black band, bearing the inscription, “Blessed are the merciful.” This shield is set in a framework of palm-branches, in bright green enamel, tipped with gold, and united at the bottom by a ribband of blue enamel, inscribed “Crimea,” in golden letters. The cipher of the royal donor, V. R., surmounted by a crown in diamonds, is charged upon the centre of the cross. On the back is a golden tablet, on which is an inscription by the hand of Her Majesty. The jewel is not, apparently, intended to be fixed as a brooch, but rather as the badges of an Order are worn.

LOSS OF THE PACKET-SHIP “ST. DENIS.” — Among the distress-

ing shipwrecks of this season is that of the packet-ship *St. Denis*, a double-decked vessel of 997 tons burthen, which had made regular trips between Havre and New York during the past eight years. Being intended for the passenger trade, she was strongly built and handsomely fitted up. She sailed from New York in the beginning of January, with a valuable cargo, and 13 passengers. Her crew consisted of 33 men. When two days out she encountered a terrible hurricane; her decks were swept by the seas; she sprung a leak and became water-logged. When it appeared that the ship was about to founder, an attempt was made to get out the boats. The long-boat only was launched, and she was so much shattered that the captain and passengers shrunk from embarking in her, alleging that she could never live in such a sea. The first and second mates and nine seamen got into her, and hung about the ship, endeavouring to persuade others to partake the risk. But the ship went down before their eyes, carrying with her the captain and the rest of the crew, and all the passengers.

FEBRUARY.

1. THE PEACE.—THE ARMISTICE.—The following is the text of the Protocol signed at Vienna this day, by the Representatives of the Five Powers.

“In consequence of the acceptance by their respective Courts of the five propositions contained in the document hereunto annexed, under the title of Draft of Preliminaries, the undersigned, after having paraphrased it, conformably

to authorization received to that effect, have agreed that their Governments shall each nominate Plenipotentiaries, who, furnished with the full powers necessary for proceeding to the signature of formal preliminaries of peace, shall conclude an armistice and a definitive treaty of peace. The said Plenipotentiaries will have to assemble at Paris within the term of three weeks dating from this day, or sooner if it can be done.

“Done at Vienna, this 1st day of February, 1856.”

The armistice, which was arranged by the Commanders of the opposing armies at the seat of war, on the 29th February, extended to the 31st of March.

— GREAT FIRE AT ROTHERHITHE.—About three o'clock in the afternoon, a destructive fire broke out in the extensive range of premises of Messrs. Evans and Co., ship - provision merchants and bottled-beer and wine merchants, carrying on business at Trinity Wharf, Rotherhithe, adjoining the premises of Messrs. Brocklebank and Rolt, large deal timber merchants.

The building in which the fire commenced, was upwards of 100 feet long, and over 100 feet in depth, and contained a vast quantity of bottled beer, ale, and wine, intended for exportation, of which a large portion was ready for shipment to the Crimea. As many persons were about, the smoke was soon seen, and the alarm being given, engines were quickly on the spot.

By the time the firemen arrived they found that the entire length and breadth of the extensive property was enveloped in one tremendous sheet of flame, and there seemed not the least chance of

saving the timber stores of Messrs. Brocklebank. The engines were speedily got to work, and there being an ample supply vast streams of water were thrown upon the blazing pile; but the flames continued to defy the exertions of all present, and soon the roof of the wharf fell in with a crash resembling a clap of thunder. The fire then mounted so high into the air as to be distinctly seen from almost every part of London. The great exertions of the fire-brigade prevented the further extension of the flames, and Messrs. Brocklebank's premises were saved, although they were much damaged by fire and water.

3. MURDER OF A WIFE AND THREE CHILDREN — The neighbourhood of Soho — indeed the public generally — were horrified by the report that a man had murdered his wife and three children. The scene of this dreadful occurrence is Portland Street, Soho. An immense crowd congregated at the Marlborough Police Court the following morning to witness the examination of the murderer. The excitement was so considerable that the accused, who had surrendered himself at the Bow Street Police station, was escorted to this court by a strong body of police. The murderer proved to be William Bousfield, by trade a French polisher, residing at No. 4, Portland Street, Soho. He was a tall gaunt man, about 37 years of age, of shabby and dissipated appearance. He appeared to be unconscious of what was passing around him, and maintained a gloomy silence.

It appeared by the evidence of the wife's father, that his daughter was 28 years of age; that the prisoner and his wife had

lived on very good terms, although the prisoner was an idle fellow, passing three parts of his time in doing nothing; though he sometimes got employment as a supernumerary at a theatre, for which he received 1s. or 1s. 6d. a night. The wife, on the other hand, was steady and industrious, and attended to a small shop in which stationery, toys, tobacco, and sweet-stuff were sold. She had been put into this shop by her father, who had paid the rent, doctor's bills, and other expenses for the family. The father resided in the same house, but knew nothing of the fearful occurrence which had taken place under the same roof until informed by the police. On the birth of the third child, some dissatisfaction had arisen between the prisoner and his wife on account of his doing nothing for the maintenance of his family. The father had last seen the prisoner and his wife together on the morning of Saturday, the 2nd instant. They then appeared comfortable together, nor had he heard of any dispute occurring during the day. A woman who lodged in the same house, stated that at half-past twelve on Saturday night, she knocked at the door of the parlour in which the whole family slept, to ask for some fire-wood, which was sold in the shop. The wife answered in a cheerful voice that they were gone to bed. She was then heard to tell her husband to get the wood. He appeared to refuse surlily; and the wife then said that she should be up before six o'clock the next morning, and would leave the wood at her door. This was the last known of the unfortunate family; the rest can only be told in the words of the police officers.

Police constable Fudge said,—

On Sunday morning last, about seven o'clock, I was on duty in Bow Street, standing in the passage, when the prisoner came in. I asked where he was going to. He said "I have come to give myself up for murdering my wife." I asked where the murder was committed. He said, "At No. 4, Portland Street," and I then took him to the inspector, who ordered me to search him.

Inspector Dodd:—I was at the station in Bow Street when the prisoner was brought in to me about seven o'clock on Sunday morning. He said to me, "I have killed my wife." I said, "What do you mean; where is your wife?" He said, "She is in the back parlour, at No. 4. Portland Street, Soho." I ordered him to be searched. A wound on his neck, covered with blood, was found, and another wound on his wrist. I had his wounds attended to by the divisional surgeon. A latch-key was found on the prisoner, which I took with me in a cab to No. 4, Portland Street, and, having entered the house, I broke open the back parlour door, and I found lying on a French bedstead the dead body of a woman named Sarah Bousfield, said to be 28 years of age. The woman was lying on the bed, with her head on the left side, and a large cut under her right ear, covered with blood. I also found on the same bed the dead body of a child, named Eliza Bousfield, about four years of age. The child's head was towards the foot of the bed, with her right knee close to the body of the woman. On the other side, I found the dead body of a male child, about eight months old. There was a wound on the child's neck. I also found in a

press in the same room the dead body of a child, about six years old. This child was lying on her left side, with a wound in her neck, and covered with blood. I also found a $\frac{5}{8}$ chisel covered with blood, which I produce; this I found on the pillow of the French bedstead, and close to the dead body of the woman. I also found part of the handle of a razor, smeared with blood, under the left shoulder of the dead body of the woman. Under the body of the male child I found the blade of a razor covered with blood. I also found between the dead bodies a piece of leather. The bed and bed-clothes were saturated with blood, and a great quantity of clotted blood was on the bed and floor by the bed-side, and spots and smears of blood on the floor from the beds into the shop. I traced the blood from the beds into the shop through a glass door. There was blood also on a key in the shop-door, and blood was also on the door and on the door-posts, as if some person had gone out with their hands covered with blood, the blood being quite wet when I saw it. I also found blood on a slate-book on the counter. I secured the place, took away the keys, and went back to Bow Street. I saw the prisoner, and told him he stood charged with the murder of his wife and his three children. The prisoner said, "That is all right."

Mr. Hadaway, surgeon, after stating that he had been sent for to the house by the police, said: I found the deceased woman quite dead, with an incision in her neck from three to four inches in length. It was a clean-cut wound. I found three incisions on the right arm, and four on the left, evidently to open the veins, but very little blood had

flowed from them. There were two children on the bed quite dead. I then turned to a press bedstead in the room, and saw another child lying on it quite dead, with two incisions on the right side of the neck. Eliza Bousfield had two incisions on the right side of the neck. John William Bousfield, the infant, had two incisions on the right side of the neck, and one on the lower part of the left ear. The bodies were quite cold, and I am of opinion that they had been dead some hours. I made a *post-mortem* examination of the body of Mrs. Bousfield. I found a punctured wound on the left cheek, and penetrating through the cheek. On the lower lip there was a lacerated wound. I then came to the wound in the neck, which was a clean incised wound about four inches in length, dividing the skin integuments and all the soft parts. The carotid artery was nearly divided. There was also a small wound above the larger one about an inch in length. On the front of the left shoulder was a clean-cut wound about an inch long. There was a cut through the night-dress corresponding with the wound. On the left elbow were two other punctures, and also one at the back of the bend of the elbow. They were all superficial. On examining the right arm, about two inches above the bend of the elbow inside, there was another punctured wound, also superficial. There were no marks of wounds on the hands. The heart and other viscera were healthy. The cause of death was the division of the carotid artery. I do not think there had been any struggle. I cannot say whether the wounds on the arms were inflicted before or after death.

While the murderer had been thus firm-nerved while inflicting the wounds upon his victims, it was far otherwise when he turned his hand against himself; for the wound on his own throat was not more than an inch long, and had merely severed the skin. The prisoner, when he came to the police station, did not smell of drink, nor did he appear intoxicated, though he was greatly agitated.

The female lodger said: I have heard the prisoner was jealous, and I have heard Bousfield say many times he did not like the young men who came to the shop. He also said he thought his wife was too free with them. They slept together prior to the birth of the last child. She was a very pleasant woman in the shop, and many persons would come into the shop if she was there, but not if he was. I have heard him talk about that himself. It was Friday evening when he suddenly returned home from the theatre. He was not jealous of one particular young man.

The prisoner was tried at the Central Criminal Court in March; his counsel could not attempt to rebut the evidence, but suggested, that, considering the absence of motive, the jury might in mercy come to the conclusion that the prisoner had been attacked by some sudden frenzy, and that, therefore, he ought not to be held responsible.

The jury, however, immediately found the prisoner "Guilty." He was sentenced to be hanged.

A very shocking scene occurred at the execution of this miserable man. After his condemnation his behaviour was sullen and taciturn. He met the exhortations of the

chaplain with dogged silence, and seemed to wish to impress the officers with the idea that his mind was disordered, and even made a sham attempt at self-destruction by throwing himself onto the fire in his cell. The experienced officials could not be deceived; and the convict gave up the attempt; but he could not be prevailed upon to give any serious attention to the clergyman, nor to take food without coercion. This sullen violence he continued to the last. When pinioned by Calcraft, he assumed the appearance of utter prostration—which possibly was not altogether false, for want of sufficient food and sullen suffering had no doubt greatly reduced his physical powers. When the last hour arrived, the wretched man was raised by four gaolers, and by them carried, or dragged, to the scaffold. When placed under the beam, he appeared to be so utterly devoid of power that he could not stand, and he was seated in a chair on the scaffold, and in that position the halter was placed round his neck. This arrangement gave opportunity for the dreadful scene that ensued. The sitting position of the convict extended the rope so far as not to allow of that fall in which the efficacy of this mode of execution consists, and consequently when the platform fell from beneath him, death or insensibility did not take place. Scarcely had the dull heavy sound of the falling drop been heard, when a horrified exclamation issued from the crowd, “He is up again!” To the horror of the spectators it was seen that the miserable man had made a desperate—a most extraordinary—muscular effort, by which he had raised his lower limbs to the level

of the drop, and that both his feet were actually resting on the edge; and that he was trying to raise his pinioned arms to the rope. One of the officers instantly rushed upon the scaffold and pushed the wretched man’s feet from their resting-place; when strange, if the report be correct, in one instant, by another marvellous effort, he threw himself towards the other side, and again succeeded in getting both his feet on the edge of the drop. Calcraft, the executioner, who had left the scaffold, now returned, and forced his feet from the scaffold, so that he remained suspended. The dreadful scene was not yet over. The short relief the miserable criminal had thus obtained had probably enabled him to breathe, and, to the horror and astonishment of the spectators, he, for the third time, succeeded in placing his feet upon the edge of the scaffold! Calcraft and other officers again pulled off his feet from their rest, and held the wretch from further exertion until he had ceased to struggle. During the time this fearful scene was enacting, the horrified shrieks, yells, and hissing of the people who surrounded the scaffold, made the occurrence yet more appalling. Nor did it all diminish the ghastly horror of the circumstances, that while the perpetrator of such horrible crimes was expiating his deeds in so horrible a manner, the steeples of the neighbouring churches were pouring forth merry peals on the announcement of peace.

3. COLLISION AT SEA — DESTRUCTION OF THE “JOSEPHINE WILLIS.”—Another of those fearful catastrophes which have of late been so frequently chronicled—the destruction, by collision, of a noble

ship, and of property of immense value, with the loss of many lives—occurred in the Channel, a few miles beyond the South Foreland. The *Josephine Willis* was one of the first-class ships chartered by Messrs. Willis and Co., to form their monthly line of packets running between London and New Zealand. She was of 786 tons register, was manned by a crew of 40 men. She cleared out from St. Catherine's Docks on the 1st, laden with a very valuable cargo, and with 10 first-class and 60 steerage passengers. She was surveyed by the authorised emigration agent, and certified to be sound and well found in every respect. She sailed from the port of London on the 2nd, was towed out of the river, and was left by her pilot off Deal at 6 P.M. of Sunday, the 3rd. She passed the South Foreland soon after. The sky was clear and light, but on the water and horizon the atmosphere was hazy. Soon after 8 P.M., as the ship was sailing about seven knots, the look-out men descried lights which indicated a steamer advancing straight upon them. An effort was made to alter the ship's course, or at least to ease the blow; but in vain, for in a few moments she was struck by the steamer, coming stern on, just before the main rigging. The steamer was the screw Limerick trader *Mangerton*, of 363 tons register. It would seem that the engines of the steamer were stopped immediately before the collision, and were backed immediately afterwards; but the ship had cut so deeply into the unfortunate *Josephine Willis*, and her bowsprit and funnel had become so much entangled with the rigging, that it was full ten minutes before she got

clear; during this period, several of the crew of the stricken vessel scrambled on board the *Mangerton*, which, having got clear, is stated to have backed off to a short distance. The terror and despair which seized the unfortunate passengers of the *Josephine Willis* must be left to the imagination; all rushed on deck, and, with frantic cries, sought to gain the steamer, to lower the boats, to seize spars. Captain Canney behaved with the utmost firmness and resolution; he sought to calm their terrors, and to direct their efforts. Under his directions the life-boat was successfully lowered; the quarter-boat was also got into the water, although much injured. By that recklessness of ultimate consequences compared with present inconveniences, which seems to characterise merchant sailors in this respect, and which calls for legislative interference, the plugs of these boats were wanting; nevertheless, 26 of the passengers and crew were conveyed in safety to the *Mangerton*. In the meanwhile the commander of the latter was under apprehension that his vessel was seriously damaged; but having ascertained that the injuries were not of such a nature as to infer immediate danger, he resisted the entreaties of the passengers to run his ship towards the shore, and resolved to stay by the sinking ship. Though he took this resolution, he appears to have offered little active assistance to the perishing wretches; for although two boats were lowered—with great difficulty, on account of the improper manner in which they were stowed, and when lowered, were found to have neither plugs nor tholes—yet one of them was manned only by two seamen passengers

(very young men) who could obtain no further aid from the captain. These two gallant men—the only persons who appeared to have shown any zeal or activity in the whole terrible business — saved seven of the despairing wretches. In the meanwhile, the *Josephine Willis*, with her miserable freight, was perishing fast. Her starboard side was stove in, she was thrown over on her beam-ends, and was full of water. The captain was doing all that firmness could do; he had collected his passengers aft, and when the ship heeled over and went down, head foremost, a mass of despairing wretches was seen clinging to the shrouds and rigging. In the meanwhile what were the men and boats, who had conveyed a few fortunate ones to the *Mangerton*, doing? Of late years, the narrative of terrible disasters at sea has had to chronicle too frequently the selfishness and apathy of the men to whom the safety and the lives of their passengers is entrusted.

“The life-boat,” says Mr. Yardley, the magistrate, who, with Captain Robertson, had been appointed by the Board of Trade to make an official inquiry into this disaster, “the life-boat, with a portion of the ship’s crew, after having placed her passengers in the *Mangerton*, lay off for nearly two hours, within hearing of the cries of 40 persons clinging to the wreck, without an effort being made to afford relief. The chief officer was taken on board the *Mangerton*, where he remained without making an effort to succour the crew and passengers of his ship, either by his own exertions or by commands or entreaties. It is true, he was at first benumbed from immersion, but from this he

soon recovered. The second officer showed equal apathy and want of feeling.”

The *Mangerton* had fired rockets and blue-lights, which were seen by the men of a Deal lugger, which instantly made sail, and being informed that a ship was sinking close at hand, hastened to the spot. They heard loud cries of people in distress a quarter of an hour before reaching the ship; but before they arrived, these cries were mostly hushed in death, for they found seven persons only clinging to the wreck. These were saved—making, in all, 41 persons rescued out of 110. Of the 69 persons drowned, 57 were passengers and 12 of the crew. The commander, Canney, was among those who perished. The ship appeared to have sunk upon a bank, for, on the following morning, her three masts could be seen above water.

The commander of the *Mangerton* was put on his trial on three charges of manslaughter, returned by coroner’s juries. It was not alleged that the prisoner had been the wilful cause of the disaster; but that he had left his vessel in the charge of an incompetent person, who, by his neglect or ignorance of the regulations prescribed by the Act of Parliament, caused the collision. By the evidence, however, it was clear that no case of criminal neglect could be made out; the judge therefore stopped the case and directed an acquittal.

7. THE MURDER OF MR. WAUGH
—TRIAL OF THE MURDERER.—
At the Central Criminal Court.—Charles Broadfoot Westron, described as a clerk, was placed at the bar to take his trial for the wilful murder of George Waugh, on the 16th January last. (See p. 9.) The prisoner, who is a diminutive

and deformed person, appeared to pay little attention to the evidence which described the perpetration of the crime, but is said to have taken a keen interest in the testimony which referred to the state of his mind. The particulars of this cruel murder have been already given, and it is therefore needless to repeat the statement of the counsel for the Crown; who, after relating the facts, said that there could be no possible ground for doubting that it was the prisoner's hand that had caused the death of the unfortunate gentleman; but that an attempt would be made on the prisoner's behalf, to show that he was not responsible for his actions by reason of insanity. It rested with the prisoner's counsel to make out that case.

Mr. Pitfield said:—I am clerk to a solicitor. On the morning of the 16th January I was in Bedford Street, and saw the prisoner standing near Bedford Row. He appeared to be going into Bedford Row, but suddenly stopped, and stood close to the railings at the corner of the street. About half-past ten o'clock I saw Mr. Waugh on the opposite side of the way, and at this moment I observed the prisoner take something from his sleeve, and then walk up the street towards Mr. Waugh; when he was about four yards from him he raised his arm, and presented something shining at him, at the same time exclaiming, "You villain, you have ruined me; why did you rob me of my property?" Immediately afterwards I heard the report as of a pistol, and the deceased exclaimed, "Hold him—collar him—he has murdered me," and fell to the ground. I went towards the prisoner, and he drew

a second pistol from his pocket, and cocked it with his left hand. I then said to the prisoner, "Why did you shoot the poor man?—you ought not to have done that." He replied, "He has ruined me—he has robbed me of my property." I said, "Now you have ruined yourself." The prisoner answered, "I don't care—I have done it," and dropped the second pistol. Mr. Waugh at this time was lying on the ground, but he was not dead. He remained on his legs a few minutes after he was shot. Some persons then came up, and the prisoner was seized and taken to the station-house.

Mr. Ballantine, the prisoner's counsel, declined to cross-examine the witness, and said he was not in a position to dispute the facts.

Thomas Hutchins, the street-keeper, said that he heard the report of fire-arms in Bedford Row, and on going to the spot he saw the deceased on the pavement. The prisoner was exclaiming, "He has ruined me, and I will be the ruin of him." Witness assisted to convey him to the police station; and as they were going along the prisoner said he wanted his money to go abroad with. He then took a knife from his pocket, and witness took it from him.

Sergeant Hayes, of the Metropolitan Police, proved that the prisoner was given into his charge for the murder of Mr. Waugh. When the charge had been entered, the prisoner said the deceased had brought it all upon himself. He had robbed him of his property, some acres of land. He added, "He was a relation of mine—he married into our family;" and he then turned round in the dock, and said, "Now I am satisfied." Two pistols were handed to wit-

ness, and he found one of them to be loaded. The other had been recently discharged, and the nipple was broken.

Inspector Checkley proved that as he was taking the prisoner to Clerkenwell Police Court, he told him that if it had not been for the deceased he should have had 800*l* ; but now he should only have 400*l*., and God only knew when he should get that, as it had been thrown into Chancery. He afterwards searched the prisoner's lodging at Kensington, and found a bullet mould, powder, and bullets, and caps.

Witness ascertained that the prisoner purchased the pistols 18 months ago.

Mr. Erasmus Wren, a surgeon, stated that he examined the body of the deceased, and found a gunshot wound. The death was occasioned by a bullet that had traversed the body and passed through the heart, and death must have been almost instantaneous.

Letters that were produced were in the handwriting of the prisoner. He also said that the deceased had acted as solicitor for the prisoner for a considerable time, and he had frequently seen the prisoner at the office of the deceased in Great James Street, Bedford Row.

Mr. James Barrow, clerk to the deceased, proved that in October last, in consequence of a letter that was sent by the prisoner to the deceased, Mr. Waugh obtained a summons against the prisoner, and complained that his life was in danger, as he believed, from him, and it was also stated in the prisoner's presence, that he was in the habit of carrying firearms about with him. The summons was heard at Clerkenwell police court, and the prisoner attempted to pass it

off as a laughing matter, and said it was a delusion on the part of Mr. Waugh to imagine such a thing. The magistrate asked him for an explanation, and he said he had none to give, as he did not mean anything by the expressions in the letter. The magistrate ultimately required him to give an assurance that he would not go to Mr. Waugh's office any more, and to retain another solicitor, and he said he would, and the complaint was withdrawn. The magistrate did not place the prisoner under any recognisances whatever. The prisoner did not go to the office after the proceedings at the police court. Witness was aware of the circumstances connected with the Chancery suit, and that Mr. Waugh had taken it up for the family, and but for that the family would never have probably received a farthing.

Mr. W. Sandys, a solicitor, proved that he was concerned for the prisoner in the sale of his one-fifth share of the property, and the 14th of January was appointed for the completion of the conveyance. On the morning of that day he received a communication from Mr. Ment, one of Mr. Waugh's clerks, and he afterwards told the prisoner that Mr. Waugh claimed to deduct certain charges from the purchase-money to which he (witness) objected, and that consequently the purchase could not be completed. The prisoner was very angry, and was exceedingly rude, and said he would have nothing more to do with the transaction, and left the office, and he saw no more of him until after this occurrence had happened.

A police constable proved that on the day prior to the melancholy occurrence, the prisoner was watch-

ing the deceased near his residence at Notting Hill.

A letter written to the prisoner by the deceased, dated the 10th October, 1855, was put in and read. It described the prisoner's conduct at his office that morning as insulting, impertinent, and unwarrantable, and declared the writer's intention to revert to the decision adopted some time since when the prisoner had pursued a similar course, viz. to decline all personal intercourse, and to conduct all future business, either by letter or through the clerks. It was in answer to this that the prisoner wrote the letter upon which the proceedings in the police court were founded, and which was as follows:—

“October 11, 1855.

“Sir—You have been told by me over and over again, that I will not sanction (on my own behalf, *i. e.*). You say I can do nothing. Mr. Howse taking a fresh lease at the rental of 220*l.* a year, subject to such swindling deductions as are made through you—viz. expenses, collecting half-year's rent (for me), 20*l.*; taxes, against income 1*l.* 5*s.*, making 12 or 13 per cent. on the rent, besides other expenses. The first part of your letter contains a quotation of some expressions you state I made use of in your presence; it is possible I have, but more probable I have not, exactly, as you wrote it without an additional consonant, that would have given it a more significant bearing, and have been a more apt return of a *sotto voce* benediction of your own to me. With respect to the other part of your letter, wherein you state you will not see me, I must distinctly give you to understand that you are too dear to me to allow of my breaking our five

years' acquaintance in that abrupt manner, and therefore I shall take the liberty of not only calling, but request that you will be visible on the 21st of this month, which will be three months from the time I last wrote you, of which you appear quite oblivious, as also the lapse of time since you served me with a notice of your intention to dispose of the property. I shall have nothing further to say to you, but simply this, that it is my intention to see your son, as I presume he will be placed in your shoes before long, and I should like for him to know how he will be situated with me when such an event occurs, as there seems more truth than you perhaps fancy in the remarks made by Mr. Ellis, of Tiverton, when he observed that my life hangs on a thread; and had he completed the sentence it would have been, ‘and this gentleman's on my right hangs on a puff of smoke.’ I do not intend to have any more correspondence with you, and having answered your letter, I am, sir, yours respectfully,

“C. B. WESTRON.”

This was the case for the prosecution.

Mr. Ballantyne addressed the jury for the defence. He said they would no doubt be aware, from the course he had taken in not cross-examining any of the witnesses, that he did not mean to dispute the facts of the case, about which there could be no possible doubt. It was clear that a horrible act of assassination had been committed in open day, and that the prisoner was the person who had committed that act; but he at the same time felt quite sure that, whatever indignation and horror the jury might feel at the perpetration of such a crime, they would not find any

man guilty of it if it were made out to their satisfaction that he was not of sound mind, and consequently not responsible for his actions. This was the defence he was instructed to make on behalf of the prisoner; and he believed that, when the jury had heard the evidence he should lay before them upon the point, they would return a verdict, the effect of which would be, not that he would escape punishment, but that his life would be spared, and that he would be placed for the rest of his days in a position where there would be no chance of his doing any further mischief. He was aware that the defence of insanity was not a popular one; but he should not shrink from the performance of what he conceived to be his duty on that account, and he felt assured that the jury would not hesitate on returning a verdict that the prisoner was not responsible for the act he had committed, if the evidence laid before them was such as would enable them justly and conscientiously to come to that conclusion.

Mrs. Ogbourne said, in March, 1854, the prisoner lodged in her house. She showed him the bedroom, where there was a full-sized bed, when he first came, and he said he could not believe the bed was long enough for him, and he should like to measure it. The bed was six feet long, and she said her husband laughed at the idea of the bed not being long enough for the prisoner. The prisoner stayed in the lodging until the month of May following, and during that period he behaved in a very eccentric manner. She frequently spoke to him three or four times without being able to obtain an answer, and he frequently talked

very loudly to himself, both at night and in the daytime, and he seemed in a very excited state, and made use at times of very bad language. Every time he went out the prisoner used to stand in front of the house and eye it over for two or three minutes. Sometimes his conversation was rational, and at others it was frivolous and childish, and when any allusion was made to himself he would stop abruptly, and from all she saw of him it was her opinion that he was not right in his mind.

Elizabeth Williams, sister of the last witness, said that she had frequently had conversations with the prisoner, and she had heard him walk about his room, and throw about the furniture. She had also heard him say that he wanted some sprats to make a fire to burn the devil, who, he said, was always walking about after him and annoying him. He also said that he wished there was a trap-door to the house, that he might get outside and try to see the devil, and that he would challenge him to fight. One evening she was ironing, and the prisoner asked her to lend him the flat-iron, that he might see whether it would frighten the devil. The prisoner also said he should like to get some bullets to shoot the devil with; the prisoner appeared strange and deranged in his mind, and not to know what he was about. He informed her that he was engaged in some legal proceedings, and they were aware that he received letters from his lawyer.

Mr. W. Essex said, that about July, 1854, the prisoner lodged in his house. He only remained a week, when witness ordered him to quit, in consequence of the strangeness of his conduct. He used to run up and down stairs at night,

and he left the candle burning close by his bed-side. He did not know what he ran up and down stairs for. It occurred about two or three o'clock in the morning. He did not exactly consider the prisoner a madman, but his conduct was so strange that he got rid of him.

Mrs. Margaret Jones proved that the prisoner lodged in her house in August, 1854, and for three or four months following. His conduct during the time was very strange. He used to make his tea in a narrow mug, and he told her if any of his friends came after him she was to shove them in the gutter. He frequently sat for two or three hours without saying a word. She once went into his room to put up a clean blind, and he made a strange noise like a dog, and she was very much frightened.

Mr. W. Carter proved that the prisoner took apartments in his house about December, 1854, and remained in his house about three weeks. His conduct was very strange all the time, and they became quite afraid of him. He used to talk to himself, and appeared very wretched, and it was witness's opinion that he was not fit to be trusted by himself.

Mrs. Elizabeth Rippon proved that the prisoner lodged in her house from December, 1854, until February, 1855. She thought his conduct was very strange when he took the apartment. He stooped down, and felt all over the floor to see if there were any cracks to let in draught. Her opinion was that the prisoner was not sane, and they, in consequence of that impression, gave him notice to quit. They were anxious to get rid of the prisoner at the end of the first week, in consequence of his conduct.

A number of other witnesses, in whose houses the prisoner had lodged down to the month of December, 1855, were then called, all of whom gave evidence of a similar description. It appeared that upon one occasion he had burned some article in his room, and said that his object was to drive out the evil spirit. It also appeared that upon two occasions he had tied a handkerchief round his neck so tightly as almost to strangle himself. Several of the witnesses spoke to hearing the prisoner constantly talking to himself; and one of them stated, in answer to a question put by the counsel for the Crown, that she heard him say "I will give it him, he shall have it. I have stood it long enough."

Mr. Rodhem, solicitor, at Wellington, in Somersetshire, said he was well acquainted with the prisoner's family, and he had known him from a child. His father destroyed himself by cutting his throat. Witness was concerned in the Chancery suit that Mr. Waugh was conducting for the benefit of the prisoner, and his brothers and sisters, and he could state that Mr. Waugh had behaved most kindly in the matter; and, in fact, he had been the means of getting the estate for the family. The prisoner was always of a morose and sullen disposition, and there was a good deal of insanity in the family, and he had heard that the prisoner's uncle destroyed himself.

Mr. John Walsh, a surgeon, deposed that the uncle of the prisoner was under restraint for two years before his death, and he died in a lunatic asylum.

Mr. F. Westron, a brother of the prisoner, deposed that one of his aunts died in a lunatic asylum.

Mr. Farnham Flower, a medical gentleman residing in Somersetshire, deposed that he attended the prisoner three years ago, at the residence of his brother-in-law, at Oakhill, in that county. At this time he was evidently suffering under great mental disturbance, but it was difficult to ascertain the exact nature of his malady, because no rational answer could be obtained to any question that was put to him. He had no doubt that his mind was affected at that time, and the act he was now charged with committing confirmed this opinion. He had heard all the evidence that had been adduced, and in his opinion, at the time the prisoner shot Mr. Waugh, he was incapable of distinguishing between right and wrong.

Mr. Justice Wightman asked the witness if he thought the prisoner was in such a state, as to his mind, as to be incapable of knowing that it was wrong to kill a man.

The witness said that perhaps he could not go that length; but he inferred, from all that had taken place, that he was at the time incapable of distinguishing between right and wrong.

Dr. Synnot deposed that he had had a great deal of experience in cases of lunacy, and had acted with Dr. Sutherland and other eminent persons in such cases. On Wednesday he had a short interview with the prisoner in Newgate in the presence of Dr. Gibson, the surgeon of the gaol. The result of the interview was that the prisoner was labouring under a great deficiency of mind. In all such cases it was very important to ascertain whether there was any taint of insanity in the family; and the evidence he had heard upon that point, and the other facts in the

case, led him to come to the conclusion that the prisoner at the time he committed this act was incapable of distinguishing between right and wrong. He would not take upon himself to say that the prisoner was not aware that killing a man was wrong, but he was of opinion that he had no idea of the enormity of the act. Many lunatics would be aware perfectly well that the act was a wrong one.

Mr. Clarkson, on behalf of the Crown, replied.—He urged that the case had failed on the part of the defence, and he contended that although the prisoner might have acted in a foolish manner at some of the lodgings he had occupied, and that he was probably a bad-tempered, excitable person, nothing had been shown to justify the jury in coming to the conclusion that at the time he committed this dreadful act, he was not perfectly aware of what he was doing, and was therefore fully responsible.

The learned judge then proceeded to sum up. He went through the whole of the evidence very carefully, and said that there could be no doubt upon the facts, and the only question the jury had to decide was, whether the prisoner was proved to have been in such a state of mind at the time the act was committed as not to know the distinction between right and wrong; and if that was not made out to their full satisfaction, they had only one duty to perform; and however painful it might be to them to do so, they were bound to return a verdict of wilful murder.

The jury, after considerable deliberation, returned a verdict of "Guilty" of wilful murder, but recommended the prisoner to mercy on account of his strong predisposition to insanity.

Mr. Justice Wightman, after conferring for some time with Mr. Justice Willes, addressed the prisoner and said that the jury, who were the best judges in such case, had come to the conclusion that, although he might be insane upon some points, yet that he knew right from wrong, and they recommended him to mercy. Under these circumstances he should abstain from passing sentence of death, and merely order judgment of death to be recorded.

The prisoner upon this stepped in front of the dock and said, "I never made any defence—I never gave orders for any. What they have done, they have done for themselves. I have been perjured away." The sentence on the prisoner was commuted into penal servitude for life.

7. DESTRUCTIVE STORM IN THE NORTH.—On the night of Wednesday and morning of Thursday, a very severe storm visited the south of Scotland and north of England, and did great damage. At Greenock, the destruction of chimneys and tiles was great, houses and sheds were unroofed, and walls were blown down. The vessels in the road suffered much; many of the smaller craft were driven on shore, and the larger lost masts, spars and cables. Some seamen were drowned. At Glasgow, the damage was much more extensive; the smaller houses of the suburbs suffering greatly. The streets were covered with fragments of tiles and pots. Several chimney-stalks (including one of those of Messrs. Tennant's works, at St. Rollox, 350 feet high) were blown down, and in some cases fell upon the buildings below. A large range of workshops in course of erection for the Caledonian Railway were reduced to ruins. At Govan, a

southern suburb, the roof of Messrs. Dixon's iron-works, and two magnificent building-sheds of Messrs. Laird and McGregor, at Patrick, were unroofed; the loss of the latter firm is estimated at from 15,000*l.* to 20,000*l.* The ships in the river were much damaged, and some sunk. Pollockshaws, Bowling, and all the country round suffered in like manner. The storm was equally fierce at Paisley, Ayr, and Helenburgh. Several lives were lost.

In the north of England, the storm was felt with the greatest severity about Shields and Newcastle. The injury done to the shipping in the Tyne, by collision, stranding, &c., is estimated at 20,000*l.* The country-side appears also to have suffered greatly. In many cases the electric telegraph posts along the lines were blown down.

14. DESTRUCTION OF THE PAVILION THEATRE, WHITECHAPEL.—About 8 o'clock this morning, the Royal Pavilion Theatre, Whitechapel Road, was discovered to be on fire. The alarm being given, the parish engine and a brigade engine were speedily at the spot; but they could do nothing because of the great length of hose which had to be fixed before water could be conveyed to them. The fire, consequently, spread over the whole of the machinery and scenery above and under the stage. A strong force of the fire brigade arrived, and by their exertions hose was carried through passages and entries, and through houses, so that at length the engines were enabled to play on the fire. Their efforts were entirely ineffectual, for the flames spread with the extraordinary rapidity which has been observed in fires in these edifices; insomuch that half an hour after

the first discovery, they had extended over the pit, boxes, and proscenium. The firemen were now driven out of the house, and it was apparent that the roof had caught. A very short time sufficed to complete the destruction, for the roof fell in soon after 9 A.M., and by 10 o'clock the whole edifice was a heap of flaming and smoking ruins. The precise cause of the disaster was not discovered; but one of the dramatic performances of the previous evening had been a terrific drama entitled *The Red Crow*, the catastrophe of which is the burning of the Robin Hood Tavern; and it is probable that some embers of the theatrical conflagration had fallen among the machinery or scenes, and had given rise to the veritable catastrophe.

14. GREAT FIRE AT CLERKENWELL.—A fire, which destroyed a large factory and fourteen houses, broke out in Clerkenwell, about six o'clock in the morning, and was not extinguished until late in the evening. The scene of the disaster was the large factory of Mr. White, an ivory, brass and wood turner, in Yardley Street, Exmouth Street, and the numerous small houses that surround it. The flames were first seen by a policeman, issuing from the roof of the factory, and an alarm was immediately given. But before the messengers could arrive at the engine stations, the flames had burst through the roof, and the brilliant light which illuminated a large part of the metropolis had given warning, and the engines were already on their way. Speedy as was their advent, the fire had already done much of its work; for owing to the combustible nature of the stock it had already extended over the whole workshops and engine-house,

and had spread to the stock in the yards, and to several neighbouring houses. As all attempts to save the premises of Mr. White would have been useless, the firemen directed their efforts to the stock and dwellings, and in this they so far succeeded that they were not utterly destroyed. Fourteen dwelling-houses were seriously injured.

20. MURDER OF THE DUCHESSE DE CAUMONT LAFORCE.—A great sensation has been created at Paris by the murder of one of the *ancienne noblesse*, the Duchesse de Caumont Laforce, a member of one of the most distinguished of the old French families. The Duchess was a very eccentric character. She had separated from the Duke, her husband, and occupied an hotel on the right side of the Champs Elysées, beyond the Rond Point; situated at the bottom of a spacious alley, closed in front and on the sides by walls reaching to the first story of the neighbouring houses; along the walls are the stables and carriage-house. The Duchess had formerly, as became her rank, several persons in her service, but she quarrelled with them all, and discharged them one after the other. She took other servants, but none of them stopped with her long. At length, she determined to have only one servant, and as she found it particularly difficult to agree with females, she decided that a man-servant would suit her best. As, too, she had a pair of horses to take care of, though she scarcely ever used them, she was obliged to choose a groom or coachman; in addition to his stable and other duties, the man had to attend to the outer door, there being no concierge. The Duchess had several grooms in succession, none of

them remaining with her, and it sometimes happened that she was altogether without a servant. About a fortnight ago she was in this predicament, when a man named Baumann, 32 years of age, a native of Wurtemberg, hearing of the place, offered his services, and was accepted without any inquiry as to his character. Baumann appears to have been tolerably attentive to his duties; but this did not preserve him from the reproaches of the Duchess. These he at first bore in silence; but, being of an irascible character, he became impatient, and said that they were unjust. The Duchess persisted, and he, finding that there was no chance of pleasing her, took the resolution of paying no attention to what she said. The Duchess, on this, became more exacting than ever; minutely inspected the manner in which the man did his work, and scolded him for what appeared to her the slightest negligence. On the morning of the murder, Baumann served breakfast to his mistress, and then went to clean out the alley opposite the stables. Whilst he was so engaged, the Duchess went to him, and began scolding him for the manner in which he did his work. The man, in spite of his resolution not to answer her, became greatly exasperated, and replied insolently. A violent altercation ensued, and, bursting into a paroxysm of rage, he rushed on the Duchess, struck her a furious blow with his clenched fist on the head, which knocked her senseless to the ground, and then taking her up, he flung her onto a heap of manure. After a while, seeing that she remained without motion, he carried the body into a stable, placed it under a heap of litter, and, after pressing

the straw on it, threw a number of pieces of wood over all. Afterwards he went into the house, and took two pieces of gold of 20fr. each, a piece of 5fr., and two cakes of chocolate, but did not touch a quantity of plate, or some other articles of value which were lying about. The Duchess, on being struck, uttered a loud cry, which was heard by the occupiers of the adjacent house, some of whom came to the window, but saw nothing. An American gentleman, however, who had happened to be standing at his window when the Duchess had gone to speak to her servant, supposed that the cry had come from her, and determined on going down to ask if she had not been taken suddenly ill. Just as he was about to knock at the *porte cochère*, Baumann opened it, and the American asked where he was going. "I am going into the neighbourhood on an errand for my mistress," answered the man. "But," said the gentleman, "where is your mistress, and why did she cry out just now?" "She is in the stable," replied Baumann, with the greatest calm, "and she cried out because I was murdering her!" As the man's blouse was stained with blood, it struck the gentleman that this declaration, extraordinary as it was, might be true, and calling a *sergent-de-ville*, who was near at hand, gave him into custody. The gentleman, accompanied by some other persons, entered the stable, and the dead body of the Duchess was found beneath the straw and wood. The murderer, being taken before the commissary of police, was interrogated, and not only confessed without hesitation that he had committed the crime, but gave the most minute details of it; he, however, denied that he had premedi-

tated it, or that even when he had assaulted the duchess, he had intended to kill her.

17. SUICIDE OF MR. JOHN SADLEIR, M.P.—This morning the body of Mr. John Sadleir, Member of Parliament for Sligo borough, was found cold and stiff on Hampstead Heath. It is probable that the conduct of no private individual has been productive of a larger amount of social misery than that of the unhappy man who had now terminated a career of deliberate and deep-laid swindling by a deliberate and well-timed suicide. As a labourer was wandering over the Heath in search of a strayed donkey about half-past eight on Sunday morning, he found the body of the deceased on the grass at the back of Jack Straw's Castle. It was lying on the rise of a small mound, in a spot which seemed to have been carefully selected. The clothes were undisturbed, except that the hat had fallen off to a slight distance. It was lying on the back, with the head close to a small furze-bush. It had evidently been lying there a great part of the night, as it was quite cold, and the *rigor mortis* completely established. By the side of the deceased were lying a bottle labelled in several places "Essential Oil of Almonds," and "Poison," and contained a small quantity of the drug; a silver cream-ewer, smelling strongly of prussic acid; and a case of razors. In the pockets of deceased were a 5*l.* note, 8*l.* in gold, some silver and halfpence; some pieces of lump sugar, a latch-key, and a piece of paper, on which the deceased had written, in a clear bold hand, "John Sadleir, Gloucester Square, Hyde Park," which was his residence. The corpse was

VOL. XCVIII.

taken to the Hampstead Workhouse.

The determined suicide of a gentleman so well known in political and commercial circles, caused great surprise and commiseration, for his crimes were unknown and unsuspected.

Mr. Sadleir was born in 1814, at Shrone, county Tipperary; was admitted a solicitor in Ireland in 1837, and practised in Dublin; but retired from practice in 1846. In July, 1847, he was returned to Parliament for the borough of Carlow. In December, 1852, he accepted the office of a junior Lord of the Treasury under the premiership of Lord Aberdeen, but lost his seat for Carlow in the election which became necessary. In the following July he was returned for Sligo. He ceased to be a Lord of the Treasury in January, 1854. In 1848 he became Chairman of the London and County Joint Stock Banking Company, and conducted its affairs with great ability. This office he had resigned a few months since. He was also Chairman of the Royal Swedish Railway; and the founder of the Tipperary Joint-Stock Bank, of which his brother, James Sadleir, M.P. for Tipperary, was the manager and sole director. He had been engaged in a great variety of speculations, always operating for very large amounts, and was a large purchaser of land in the Incumbered Estates Court. The rumour ran that the unfortunate man's brain had become over-excited by the multiplicity and extent of his speculations.

A coroner's inquest was held on the body, when the facts before stated were deposed to. The surgeon said that he detected a powerful odour of the essential oil of

D

bitter almonds issuing from the mouth; and on examination of the stomach he found about ten ounces of undigested food, from six ounces of which he obtained, by simple filtration, one ounce of essential oil of almonds, and by distillation two ounces. There was also a considerable quantity of opium. It was evident, from these and other symptoms, that the deceased had died from having swallowed a large quantity of these poisons.

From the evidence of the deceased's butler, it appeared that Mr. Sadleir had returned to his house to dinner about 7 o'clock on Saturday evening. This was unusual, as he generally dined at his club. When he came in he gave the butler a letter addressed to his sister-in-law in Ireland, desiring that it should be posted, and a paper which he directed him to take to Mr. Maitland, a neighbouring chemist. It stated that the groom required a quantity of essential oil of bitter almonds, and requested that 1*l*.s worth should be sent. At 9 o'clock he inquired if it had arrived; and finding that it had not, directed it to be sent for. About half-past 9 o'clock it arrived, and the butler took it to his master and placed it by his side. He was then looking over some papers. The poison was in quantity about half a pint. At a later hour the butler took up the tea-tray; the silver cream-ewer was part of the service. At a later hour the butler went into the room to remove the tray; but his master appeared not to have finished, and he left him. He saw him last about half-past 11 o'clock, and he must have left the house between that time and 1 o'clock, for when the butler went into the

room at the latter hour Mr. Sadleir was gone, and his hat and coat were missing. The servants went to bed knowing that their master had a latch-key.

As to the state of mind of the unhappy man on this miserable evening, Mr. Anthony Norris said:—I reside at No. 2, Bedford Row, and am a solicitor. I was intimately acquainted with the deceased gentleman. I saw him last alive shortly before 11 o'clock on Saturday night, at his house in Gloucester Square. I had no appointment with him, but I went up there, and was with him about half an hour. I have known him since 1843, and have frequently transacted business with him. He was engaged in several public concerns. He was pressed by his undertakings. Latterly he appeared haggard, and I noticed an extraordinary change in his appearance during the last week. He seemed to be quite borne down during the last few days by the extent of his business, and particularly by some pecuniary losses he sustained last week, and which came upon him suddenly. He talked about these affairs to me on Saturday night, but said nothing that induced me to anticipate any such thing as has happened. I noticed, as I was leaving the house, that his eyes were blood-shot, and that he was restless, and not in his usual temperament. I had never seen him in the same state before. He was always cool and collected.

Mr. Manning stated that Mr. Sadleir had several appointments with Mr. James, a solicitor, on Saturday, but he seemed to shrink from keeping them.

Mr. Norris added, that on Saturday afternoon he had an interview

with Mr. Sadleir, when he said:—"I would rather that you would not come to see me to-night as I want to get my papers together, but come to-morrow at 11 o'clock." But in consequence of receiving a letter from Ireland, which concerned Mr. Sadleir, witness went there. Mr. Sadleir was walking about the room, which was very unusual, and appeared surprised at witness going there. When witness went in he noticed a remarkable peculiarity about the eyes as though he had been weeping. On the following morning at 11 o'clock he called at the house again and heard that he was dead.

In answer to a question suggested by Mr. Manning, witness said:—"I made a remark to Mr. Stevens, at Mr. Gurney's office on Saturday afternoon, relative to Mr. Sadleir's reverses. The remark I made was, "I should not be surprised if Sadleir were to shoot himself."

Here the coroner seemed disposed to close the inquiry; but it had transpired that the deceased had left three letters in the hall, when he went out that night, with a paper directing that they should be delivered on Sunday morning if he did not return home by 9 o'clock; and the jury insisted that these papers should be produced. Nothing could have prevented the immediate disclosure of the suicide's immense frauds and forgeries; but the object of his friends in attempting to hurry these proceedings to a close was probably to obtain a verdict of "temporary insanity." They were, probably, quite unaware of the extent of his crimes.

Before the inquest again assembled all hope of stifling the facts had passed away. The Tipperary

Bank had stopped payment, and it was said that nearly the whole capital had been embezzled; other rumours of a more directly criminal nature were abroad. Mr. Norris now produced one of the three letters left in the hall by the unhappy man when he left his house on his death-errand. It was as follows:—

"Saturday night.

"I cannot live—I have ruined too many—I could not live and see their agony—I have committed diabolical crimes unknown to any human being. They will now appear, bringing my family and others to distress—causing to all shame and grief that they should have ever known me.

"I blame no one, but attribute all to my own infamous villany. —, —, —, —, —, —, —, and hundreds of others ruined by my villany. I could go through any torture as a punishment for my crimes. No torture could be too much for such crimes, but I cannot live to *see* the tortures I inflict upon others.

"J. SADLEIR.

"Telegraph to —, and otherwise when you read this."

The letter to Mr. Robert Keating, M.P. for Waterford, also one of the three, was also produced:—

"11, Gloster Terrace,

"16th February, 1856.

"Dear Robert—To what infamy have I come step by step—heaping crime upon crime—and now I find myself the author of numberless crimes of a diabolical character and the cause of ruin and misery and disgrace to thousands—ay, to tens of thousands.

"Oh, how I feel for those on whom all this ruin must fall—I could bear all punishments, but I could never bear to witness the

sufferings of those on whom I have brought such ruin—it must be better that I should not live.

“No one has been privy to my crimes—they sprung from my own cursed brain alone—I have swindled and deceived without the knowledge of any one—Stevens and Norris are both innocent, and have no knowledge of the fabrication of deeds and forgeries by me, and by which I have sought to go on in the horrid hope of retrieving.

“It was a sad day for all when I came to London.

“I can give but little aid to unravel accounts and transactions.

“There are serious questions as to my interest in the Grand Junction and other undertakings.

“Much will be lost to the creditors if these cases are not fairly treated.

“The Grand Junction, the East Kent and the Swiss Railways, the Rome line, the Coal Co., are all liable to be entirely lost now—so far as my assets are concerned.

“I authorise you to take possession of all my letters, papers, property, &c. &c. in this house and at Wilkinson’s and 18 Cannon Street.

“Return my brother his letters to me and all other papers. The prayers of one so wicked could not avail or I would seek to pray for those I leave after me, and who will have to suffer such agony, and all owing to my criminal acts.

“Oh, that I had never quitted Ireland!—Oh, that I had resisted the first attempts to launch me into speculations!

“If I had had less talents of a worthless kind and more firmness, I might have remained as I once was, honest and truthful—and I would have lived to see my dear

Father and Mother in their old age—I weep and weep now, but what can that avail?

“J. SADLEIR.

“Robert Keating, Esq., M.P.,
Shamroque Lodge, Clapham.”

The ground for the self-accusations of forgery contained in this letter, and the direct cause of the suicide, was soon explained. Mr. Josiah Wilkinson, of the firm of Wilkinson, Gurney, and Stevens, solicitors, of Nicholas Lane, stated that on the morning of Saturday Mr. Sadleir had called upon him in a very excited state, proposing to him to raise a large sum for the aid of the Tipperary Bank. The plans he proposed were altogether impracticable, and Mr. Wilkinson refused the transaction. The firm had frequently advanced large sums to Mr. Sadleir; but the balances had become so large that they had required security. This, about six weeks before, Mr. Sadleir had given. It purported to be a deed given on the purchase of an estate in the Encumbered Estate Court. Mr. Wilkinson was so much alarmed by the conduct of Mr. Sadleir upon this Saturday, and by the knowledge of the critical condition of the Tipperary Bank, that that very evening he despatched his partner, Mr. Stevens, to Dublin, for the purpose of registering it, which he had hitherto neglected doing. Mr. Stevens immediately discovered that the deed was a forgery. It was signed by two of the Commissioners and attested by two witnesses in two parts of the deed. All these signatures were forgeries. The seal upon the deed was the genuine seal of the Commissioners; but it had been transferred from some other document.

Rumours now went forth that

many other securities lodged by the deceased were also forged, particularly some of those held by the London and County Bank, to which he was indebted; but on these being tested they were found to be genuine, nor was any evidence adduced before the inquest to show what were the forgeries and what the nature of the crimes to which the deceased alluded in his last letters.

A particular inquiry was made as to what had become of a large sum of money which had been paid to Mr. Sadleir on the morning of his suicide: but no trace to its disposal could be found.

The Coroner, in summing up the evidence produced before the inquest, pointed out that the letters written by the deceased were directly to the business on which he wrote, and were perfectly in accordance with the facts; and that although they exhibited a picture of intense mental suffering—and beyond question the unhappy man had endured the most intense mental agony on the day of his death—the latter circumstance did not infer mental alienation, while the former showed that his intellect was quite under command.

The Jury unanimously returned a verdict, that the deceased died by his own hand when he was in a perfectly sound state of mind.

Of the extent of the frauds perpetrated by Mr. John Sadleir no connected statement has been published. The fraudulent transactions in respect of the Royal Swedish Railway appear to consist in an over-issue of shares and obligations to the amount of at least 150,000*l*. In respect of the Tipperary Bank, the manager, his brother, had permitted him to overdraw more than 200,000*l*., and,

with other fraudulent mismanagement, the deficit of the bank exceeded 400,000*l*. The assets were stated to be 100,000*l*.; but they proved to be little more than 30,000*l*. The misery caused by this infamous confederacy is unspeakable. Not only were the depositors in the South of Ireland—chiefly small farmers and tradesmen—defrauded of their whole savings, but the shareholders were stripped, for the most part, of every farthing they possessed. The means taken to entrap the last-named class were most infamous. On the 1st of February last—one lunar month before the crash—the Sadleirs had published a balance-sheet and report, in which the concern was represented as most flourishing. A dividend, at the rate of 6 per cent., with a bonus of 3*l*. per cent., was declared, and 3000*l*. was carried to the Reserve Fund, raising that to 17,000*l*. By means of this infamous fabrication, a considerable number of persons—most of them widows, spinsters, and half-pay officers—were induced to become shareholders and lost their all. Endless suits were brought by attorneys, who had purchased debts due by the Company, against these unhappy persons. Some declared themselves insolvent, others suddenly disappeared, and fled to the United States with such of their property as they could hastily secure. Mr. James Sadleir absconded, under circumstances which gave rise to much comment.

It is believed that the forgeries which Mr. John Sadleir had committed were fraudulent deposits of deeds in his custody, he being agent for some of the largest estates in Ireland.

The author of all this misery

was a person of very good appearance and address, but by no means showy. His dress was habitually neat, but not smart, nor did he affect any style of manners; he appeared a clear-headed active man of business, without pretensions to high-breeding, but not deficient in proper courtesy. His habits were very moderate; and his residence was rather well than handsomely furnished. In no respect had he the pretentious bearing of an habitual and dashing swindler. It is said that at one time he was actually possessed of 200,000*l*.

22. FATAL ACCIDENT AT THE SHIRE-HALL, CHELMSFORD.—The examination of five men charged with the murder of Sir John Tyrell's keeper, in a poaching affray, had been appointed to take place at 12 o'clock this day at the Shire-Hall, Chelmsford. The case had excited much interest, and in consequence a large number of persons from the town and neighbourhood thronged to the building; so many, that long after the hall, which is up-stairs, was filled, the staircases leading to it were quite crowded. The stairs consisted of stone steps, let into the wall at one end, and forming—or being intended to form—a geometrical staircase. While the desire to obtain admission to the Hall was at its height, the pressure of the people burst away the ballustrades of the third flight, and the weight of the crowd upon the outer end broke most of the stones athwart, leaving a portion embedded in the wall, while the fragments and the people on them were precipitated together on to the people and the staircase below. Considering the circumstances, it is marvellous that the destruction of life and injury to limb was not very serious; but

when the panic-stricken crowd had been removed, one person only, a lad of 18, was found to have been killed, and four persons to be seriously injured. Many other persons were slightly hurt. As, by the destruction of the stairs, the means of egress from the Hall were destroyed, the magistrates, officers, prisoners, and audience made their exit through a window on to the roof of another building.

22. LOAN OF 5,000,000*l*.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer issued a notice on the 18th instant, for a loan of 5,000,000*l*., and a funding of Exchequer Bills to the amount of 3,000,000*l*., on the following terms:

1. The Loan to be for the sum of 5,000,000*l*.

2. For every 100*l*. subscribed in money, the contractors to receive Three per Cent. Consolidated Annuities; and the biddings to be made in such Annuities.

3. The interest on the Three per Cent. Consolidated Annuities to commence from the 5th January, 1856.

4. The days of payment, and the proportions of the contributions to be paid, to be as follows:—On February 26, 1856, deposit of 20*l*. per cent. (altered to February 26, 10*l*. per cent.; March 3, 10*l*. per cent.); March 13, payment of 25*l*. per cent.; March 29, 25*l*. per cent.; April 10, 15*l*. per cent.; April 24, 15*l*. per cent.

5. For each instalment after the deposit a proportional amount of stock to be created for the contributors.

The stock for the deposit to be created at the same time with that which will be due on the last instalment.

6. Scrip receipts will be issued by the Bank in the usual manner.

7. The biddings to be made at the Treasury on Friday morning, the 22nd February, 1856, at 10 o'clock.

The amount of Exchequer Bills to be funded to be 3,000,000*l*.

The deposit to be 20*l*. per cent. on the 26th February. And the instalments, 20*l*. per cent. on the 13th March; 30*l*. per cent. on the 20th March; 20*l*. per cent. on the 10th April; 10*l*. per cent. on the 24th April.

The contractors for the Loan to have the option of contracting for the Exchequer Bill Funding on the same terms as shall be accepted for the Loan.

In the event of the contractors wishing for an option to pay money instead of Exchequer Bills, it will be received at 100*l*. 5*s*. money for every 100*l*. of Exchequer Bills.

In consequence of this intimation, Messrs. Rothschild issued a notice that they were ready to receive applications, and the result showed how complete was the confidence the public placed in the national credit, and how utterly untouched by war were our resources; for the number of applicants and the sums applied for greatly exceeded the amount required. As soon as it was known that a loan was in contemplation, exaggerated rumours were spread as to its amount, and the funds fell to $90\frac{1}{8}\frac{1}{4}$, while Exchequer Bills improved 3*s*.; but when the smallness of the amount was known they rose, the evening before the biddings, to $91\frac{1}{8}$.

On the appointed day, a considerable number of capitalists attended; but Messrs. Rothschild proved to be the only bidders. The terms they offered were that they should receive 112*l*. 5*s*. stock, for every 100*l*. money, equal to

Consols at $89\frac{1}{8}$. This was below the *minimum* price of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and was refused. The price fixed by the Chancellor was 111*l*. 2*s*. 2*d*. stock, for every 100*l*., equivalent to Consols at 90, and he offered the loan to Messrs. Rothschild at that price. Those capitalists, without leaving the room, accepted the offer; and negotiated the funding of the Exchequer Bills at the same rate. By this result it is evident that these gentlemen offered 70,000*l*., *at least*, less than they were prepared to give.

The opinion of the money market was in favour of this transaction. Consols rose slightly; the new scrip was quoted at premium, rising to $1\frac{5}{8}$, and Exchequer scrip felt the same influence.

25. SUICIDE AT THE LIVERPOOL EXCHANGE.—An inquest was held at the Northern Hospital, Liverpool, on the body of Mr. William Tatham, of the firm of Hill, Tatham, and Co., merchants and stock-brokers, who destroyed himself at the Exchange News Rooms under singular and melancholy circumstances.

Christopher Forster:—I am porter to the Exchange News Rooms. On Thursday morning last about 25 minutes to 10, I had occasion to go down to the vaults beneath the room, where there are two water-closets. The doors were closed. I observed blood proceeding from beneath one of the doors. I gave an alarm to Griffith, another porter, and we went down together, tried the door, and found it was bolted on the inside. The key of the door was on the outside. Alarm was given to Mr. Warburton, the master of the Rooms, and that gentleman went to the closet with us, and Robert Smith, an

assistant in the Rooms, also accompanied us, and broke open the door. I then saw the deceased sitting on the seat and blood issuing from a gash in his throat. I was sent to give information to Mr. Hill, deceased's partner, and on my return I assisted to remove the deceased from the closet. I returned, and found an open razor on the floor of the water-closet, and another in a case on the seat. The razor and case now produced are those I found. I also found on the seat a Bible, with a neck-tie beneath it.

John Griffiths, another porter, and Mr. Warburton, master of the Exchange News Rooms, made statements to the same effect.

Mr. Wall, surgeon to the Hospital, narrated the circumstances attending the unhappy man's death. The œsophagus and windpipe were severed; but some hope of saving his life remained, and a tube had been passed down the latter, by which slight nourishment was administered. But their skill proved insufficient to sustain life.

Henry Forshaw, attorney, said:—The firm of Hill, Tatham, and Co. were clients of mine. On Wednesday morning last, Mr. Hill and the deceased came to my office on professional business. They consulted me on business connected with their partnership, and during that conversation, I advised them in reference to extensive transactions with a mercantile firm. There appeared to me to be unusual and unnecessary excitement on the part of deceased on that occasion—so much so, that I went out of my way, as a lawyer, and advised him as a friend to subdue his feelings, and recommended Mr. Hill to do all in his power to soothe him and allay the excitement. I subsequently saw the deceased

twice alone on the same day—once at half-past two, and next at half-past four, and on the latter occasion he was more excited than at either of the previous interviews, and promised to be at my office on Thursday morning, at 10 o'clock. The next morning, as the deceased did not keep his appointment, I felt anxious about him, and wrote a letter to the firm, in which I stated that I had received “cheering” information concerning the party we had conversed about on the preceding day, requesting them to come over and see me on the subject. I sent that letter about a quarter after 10, and in 20 minutes afterwards I heard of what had happened. I was very much shocked, but not surprised, at the occurrence—the state of excitement in which the deceased was the day before being so great.

The jury immediately found a verdict of temporary insanity.

The immediate apprehension under which the deceased destroyed himself is said to have been the fear that certain large sums, due to him in a few days, would not be paid—a mere morbid idea, for the payments were made in regular course.

27. SALE OF COPYRIGHTS.—The numerous “cheap series” of popular works, which are a very distinguishing feature of the day (being even more than a development of the movement commenced by Constable, in his *Miscellany*), has given a new value to exhausted copyrights. A large sale of this kind of property has recently been made by a large publisher, who realised good sums for the works of good authors. For instance, Lover's “Rory o' More” produced 140*l.*; Captain Chamier's “Ben Brace,” and “Life of a Soldier,” 190

guineas; Ingoldsby's "My Cousin Nicholas," 95 guineas; Banim's "Smuggler," 28*l.* 10*s.*; Captain Maxwell's "Stories of Waterloo," "Bivouac," "Hector O'Halloran," and "Captain Blake," 55*6l.*; six works of Theodore Hook, 45*6* guineas; Grattan's "Heiress of Bruges," "Jacqueline of Holland," and "Legends of the Rhine," 108 guineas; Captain Trelawney's "Younger Son," 42*l.*; Lady Scott's "Trevelyan," 21*l.*; Edgeworth's "Helen," 105 guineas; Mrs. Trollope's "Vicar of Wrexhill," and "The Widow Barnaby," 104*l.*; Hood's "Tylney Hall," 121 guineas; Albert Smith's "Scattergood Family," "Adventures of Mr. Ledbury," and the "Marchioness Brinvilliers," 535*l.*; Leigh Hunt's "Experiences of a Gaol Chaplain," 45 guineas, &c. It should be observed that many of these works, after large circulation in their aristocratic form of "three vols., post 8vo., price 1*l.* 1*s.* 6*d.*," had been re-published in five shilling or half-crown volumes.

28. BURNING OF AN OIL WAREHOUSE IN THE CITY.—About nine o'clock this evening a fire broke out in an immense pile of warehouses belonging to Messrs. Allcock, Hinton, and Co., oil merchants, drysalers, &c., in Three Crane Lane, Upper Thames Street. These premises are surrounded by lofty warehouses, containing merchandise of immense value. The warehouse in which the disaster took place was five floors high, each being filled with combustible matter of nearly every description—including spirits of turpentine, oils of various kinds, naphtha, saltpetre, brimstone, milk of sulphur, and resin, and cases of salad oil, but fortunately the

flames did not reach that part of the premises. The engines of the fire-brigade were at the spot with their usual promptitude, and obtained an ample supply of water; and fortunately the state of the tide allowed of the powerful floating engine being brought up and got to work; it did wonderful service, throwing four immense jets of water over and through the burning premises. It was reported that several hundred-weight of gunpowder were on the premises; but notwithstanding this formidable danger, the firemen persevered bravely in their efforts, and got the conflagration under by one A.M. of the following morning, before it had extended to other warehouses belonging to the same firm. The value of the property destroyed was very considerable.

28. CAMBRIDGE AND EDINBURGH ELECTIONS. — Two elections of members to serve in Parliament, of more than usual interest, have taken place during this month.

The Right Hon. T. B. Macaulay, the distinguished representative of the city of Edinburgh, had resigned his seat, on the ground that the state of his health had become such as to prevent him from performing, even in an imperfect manner, his duties in the House. The candidates for the vacant honour were Mr. Brown Douglas and Mr. Adam Black, the eminent publisher. The result was, that Mr. Black was returned by 2429 votes to Mr. Douglas's 1786.

The death of the Right Hon. Henry Goulburn, for so many years the able financial colleague of Sir Robert Peel, made a vacancy in the representation of the University of Cambridge. Mr.

Walpole, Home Secretary in the Earl of Derby's Administration, resigned his seat for Midhurst in order to become a candidate. The Hon. George Denman also offered himself. Both professed Conservative principles; but Mr. Denman's Conservatism was more liberal than his opponent's.

Mr. Walpole took so decided a lead in the polling, that it was evident that his opponent had no chance. Mr. Denman, therefore, honourably withdrew. The number, when the poll was closed, were—Walpole, 886; Denman, 419.

29. THE MATFEN MURDER.—*Newcastle.*—James Conroy, 26, Michael Allen, *alias* Anderson, 23, Isabella Allen, *alias* Anderson, 55, Jane Anderson, 18, Eleanor Anderson, 15, and Elizabeth Conroy, 27, were charged with the wilful murder of Dorothy Bewicke, at Waterloo, near Matfen, on October 21.

Mr. S. Grey opened the case, of which the facts, as sworn to by the several witnesses, are these:—The deceased, who was about 66 years of age, was the owner of some cottages at Waterloo, one of which she occupied. One of the others was tenanted by James Conroy, his wife, and six children; and about the time of the murder the other prisoners, together with John Simon (who has been admitted as Queen's evidence), was staying with him as lodgers. On the morning of the 21st of October, a neighbour named Barnard Dobbin, accompanied by other persons, went to deceased's house, and found her in the bedroom, lying on the floor, with nothing on but her chemise, and with marks upon her neck, which showed that she had been strangled. Her feet were tied

together with a piece of rope, and her arms were crossed, and fastened together with a buckle-strap. There were also several scratches about her, and the position in which the body was found indicated that a violent struggle had taken place. The bedding was pulled off the bedstead, and every part of the house had been ransacked. On a closer search a hammer was found under the bed-clothes, with a hazel stick attached, apparently but newly cut; and outside the kitchen window, through which the murderers had evidently effected an entrance, was found a stick of mountain ash.

The evidence in support of this statement was entirely circumstantial. The deceased had sent her brother-in-law to remonstrate with Conroy for having taken in some lodgers, against his agreement with the deceased, and to give him warning to leave. Conroy was much enraged, and uttered some threats against the deceased. Conroy and his family were afterwards cutting besom-sticks, and they cut at the same time hazel and ash sticks, similar to those found at the scene of the murder. The strap found was such a one as Allen had been seen to wear. A halter, the supposed instrument of murder, was slightly connected with the accused; and the three female prisoners had been seen in a lane in which some spoons, part of the plunder from the old woman's cottage, had been afterwards found.

Altogether the circumstantial evidence formed strong ground for suspicion against the prisoners, but nothing amounting to reasonable certainty. The Jury found them all "Not Guilty."

MARCH.

4. THE CHELMSFORD POACHERS.

— At the Chelmsford Assizes, James Thurgood, 29, William Thurgood, 22, Thomas Thurgood, 23 (brothers), and James Guiver, 30, labourers, were charged upon the coroner's inquisition with the wilful murder of William Hales.

It was at the examination of these men at the Chelmsford town-hall, that the accident occurred which has already been narrated. The disaster had increased the interest in the case, and the Court was crowded.

The counsel for the prosecution said that the prisoners were jointly charged with the offence of wilful murder by the verdict of the coroner's jury, but that inasmuch as the grand jury had ignored the bill against the three last-named prisoners, he did not propose to offer evidence against them upon the present charge, but should confine the case entirely to the remaining prisoner, James Thurgood. He then briefly narrated the facts upon which the charge was preferred, and said he was fearful, when they had heard the evidence that would be brought forward, and also the testimony of a man who, although not an accomplice in the murder, was undoubtedly concerned in the original illegal operations of the parties, they would feel that their duty left them no alternative but to find the prisoner, James Thurgood, guilty of the heinous crime with which he was charged.

Ebenezer Chalk, the person alluded to, said: I am a labourer, and live at Fairsteed, near Chelmsford. I know all the prisoners. On the night of the 18th February we were all at Shedreck's beer-

shop, at Fairsteed, and we turned out about 10 o'clock. I then accompanied Guiver to the place where he lodged, and he went in: I waited outside, and in a short time he came out with a gun. While we were at the beer-shop I heard William Thurgood say that we were to go to-night to Sir John Tyrell's wood. When Guiver had got his gun we walked down the road, and across some fields to Boreham, where the wood is, and we met all the three Thurgoods in a lane. Each of them had a gun. The witness then detailed the proceedings of the gang, in the course of which, witness and Guiver appearing to hang back, the prisoner, James Thurgood, exclaimed, "Come on, don't be frightened; I shall not be taken this night by any one. I shall shoot any one before I will be taken this night." I then said I thought I heard some one coming up the wood towards us, and one of the prisoners replied, "Come on, there is no one coming." I said, "I shall go now," and ran out of the wood. I had no gun. When I had got a short distance I heard a strange voice say, "Come on, mates; here they are." I was running away at this time, and almost immediately after I heard these words there was the report of a gun. I kept on running, and saw nothing more of any of the prisoners till I got home, and after I had been there about ten minutes Guiver and William Thurgood came up, and Guiver asked me if I had seen anything of Teddyfor, which was a nickname for James Thurgood. I said I had not, and William Thurgood then said, "I dare say he is taken." The prisoners had their guns with them at this time.

The witness was cross-examined with the object of implicating him in various rustic misdoings, and thereby shaking his credibility.

Joseph Wisby, a keeper in the service of Sir John Tyrell, said: On the night of the 18th of February I and my father and the deceased, who were also game-keepers, were out in Duke's Wood for the purpose of watching. We heard three shots fired, and on hearing the reports we all proceeded in the direction of the sound, and as we were passing along the cart-ride we heard the report of another gun in the wood. The deceased went away from us and went into the wood, and almost immediately afterwards I heard him cry out, "Come on, mates; here they are." Upon his saying this, I and my father went into the wood in the direction of the voice. I was in advance of my father, and when I had got a very short distance I heard the deceased say, "Oh dear!" and at the same instant I saw the flash of a gun and heard the report, and then there was the sound of some heavy body falling to the ground. The flash of the gun came in the direction straight towards us, and I have no doubt that the gun must have been in a horizontal position at the time it was discharged. I kept on my way into the wood, and a few yards further on I saw the prisoner James Thurgood. He was coming towards me, but the moment he saw me he ran across the pond. At this time he had a gun in his hand. I ran after him, and stopped him on the other side of the pond, and my father came up at the same time and took the gun away from him, and threw it into the pond. I could see that the gun was not loaded

at the time. When I laid hold of the prisoner he said, "Don't hurt me. I've hurt no one." My father said to him, "No: you have only shot that poor man." We then took the prisoner to Duke's Lodge Farm, and, as we were going along, I asked him who had shot the man, and he said he did not know: there were three or four about him, and he did not know which of them shot him. My father said something to the prisoner which I did not hear, and he, in reply, said, "He fell back like a dead man certainly."

By the Court:—I saw no other man but the prisoner in the wood, but I heard the sound of several men's footsteps running away.

Examination continued.—After the prisoner had been searched, I and my father and some other persons went back to the wood, and found the deceased lying on his back and quite dead, and his head was lying in the direction we had followed him. The clothes were smouldering with fire. There was not the least appearance of any struggle having taken place at the spot where he was lying.

James Wisby, the father of this witness, corroborated his statement. He searched the prisoner and took from him a bag containing shot, some alder cases of powder, and a piece of *The London Journal* newspaper.

Mr. O. Copeland, a surgeon at Chelmsford, who had made a careful examination of the body, said, I observed a circular wound about the size of a crown-piece on the front of the neck, and a considerable portion of the deceased's clothing, such as his shirt, flannel waistcoat, and neck muffler, had been forced into the wound by the shot and remained there. The

wound was perfectly straight, and the windpipe was completely divided, and the vertebræ of the back of the neck were slightly fractured. I have no doubt, from the character of the injury, that the gun must have been presented in a perfectly horizontal position close to the neck of the deceased, and that the clothing being forced into the wound prevented the shot from passing completely through the neck. It would have been impossible for the deceased to have uttered a word after he had received the injury, as the vocal chords were completely destroyed. The immediate cause of death was most probably suffocation, but he could not, under any circumstances, have survived the injury more than two or three minutes. I extracted 65 shots from the neck of the deceased. They were not at all scattered, and from the appearances that presented themselves I have no doubt that the man who shot the deceased must have stood quite in front of him, and close to him at the time the gun was discharged. I believe the muzzle of the gun could not have been more than a yard from the deceased.

Baron Alderson (to the witness): It would not be at all an improbable occurrence, I suppose, that a man seeing himself in such a position should have exclaimed, "Oh dear?"

Witness: I think it extremely probable that the deceased made use of that expression when he saw the gun presented at him. He certainly could not have spoken after he received the injury.

Mr. Rawson, a superintendent of the Essex constabulary, produced the articles that were taken from the prisoner, James Thur-

good. He had picked up on the spot pieces of burnt paper which had formed the wadding of the gun; they were all pieces of the newspaper found in the prisoner's pocket; the shots taken from the body of the deceased corresponded precisely with the shot taken from the prisoner. The prisoner's gun was recovered and had evidently just been discharged. The lodgings of the other prisoners had been searched: their guns were still loaded, but the shot in them were quite different from those taken from the body.

Mr. Prentice, counsel for the prisoner, urged that there was no evidence to show conclusively that it was by the hand of the prisoner that the deceased had lost his life; but if the jury thought there was sufficient presumptive evidence to induce them so to conclude, there was certainly nothing to show that the act was one of wilful murder; it was much more probable that the discharge of the gun was accidental, and had occurred in a struggle between the keeper and the poacher.

The jury, however, after a short consideration, found the prisoner James Thurgood "Guilty;" and he was sentenced to death—a doom which he heard with great hardihood. The other prisoners were, of course, acquitted. The sentence on James Thurgood was commuted.

5. DESTRUCTION OF COVENT GARDEN THEATRE. — About a quarter before five o'clock this morning an alarm of fire was given in the Royal Theatre Covent Garden, and before seven o'clock this magnificent building was totally destroyed.

The immediate cause of this lamentable catastrophe remains unas-

certained; but the circumstances immediately preceding were these:—During the operatic recess Mr. Gye, the lessee of the theatre, had sublet it to Mr. Anderson, a popular performer and conjuror, who styled himself “Professor,” and the “Wizard of the North,” and who brought forward a very capital pantomime. Mr. Anderson’s speculation, which extended over ten weeks, had been successful, and he designed to terminate his season with “a Great Carnival Benefit.” The waste walls and hoardings of the metropolis—indeed the walls of all the large towns—were covered with immense placards announcing this “Grand Carnival Complimentary Benefit and Dramatic Gala, to commence on Monday morning and to terminate with a *bal masqué* on Tuesday night.” The entertainments were to comprise not only the Wizard’s own performances, but “Opera, Drama, Pantomime, Burletta, Melodrama, and Bal-Masqué.” A considerable number of spectators availed themselves of the day performances;* but the masked ball was awaited with impatience by those too numerous classes which must exist in a city so vast as London—the idle and dissipated, and those whom curiosity and the absence of moral sense incite to visit scenes of un-

* A theatrical critic, who gave an account of the successful progress of the entertainments, concludes with this unconscious prophecy:—“The audience, which by this time must have been at least three times replenished during the evening, retired between the hours of one and two, delighted as well as heartily tired with their afternoon, evening, and night’s entertainment, but perseveringly anxious to recruit their exhausted energies for the *Bal Masque*, in which the performances for the benefit of ‘Professor’ Anderson are to find, this evening, a fit, and it is said, a very splendid, conclusion.”

usual and uncontrolled excitement on the one hand—and on the other the classes who live by ministering to the vices of the former, some gaining their subsistence by the honest exercise of doubtful professions, some, utterly lost themselves, maintaining a miserable career by the destruction of others. It is known that Mr. Gye, when letting his theatre to Professor Anderson, had not at all contemplated that such an orgie would form part of his entertainments. Mr. Gye was at this time abroad, making his arrangements with foreign *artistes* for the coming season. When he received information of the intended masked ball, he immediately wrote forbidding the use of his theatre for such a purpose. Mr. Anderson had, however, before making the communication to his lessor, made all his preparations; and during the passage of the letters had carried them forward. On receiving Mr. Gye’s refusal, he again wrote, stating that he had made his arrangements, had expended a large sum of money, and that if his plans were thwarted he should be a very heavy loser. Mr. Gye, on these representations, gave a very reluctant assent, and the orgies proceeded. It would be too much to say that the immense concourse of masked figures which thronged the theatre at a late hour that evening consisted exclusively of the disreputable classes alluded to; probably many persons were induced by innocent curiosity to look upon a scene of such singular variety, and which is so rarely seen in England. The amusements proceeded with animation, and if with freedom still with decorum; until as the night advanced the more respectable or cautious

withdrew, and the "fast" and disreputable yielded to the temptations of excitement and wine. At a late hour the theatre is said to have presented a scene of undisguised indecency, drunkenness, and vice, such as the lowest places of resort have rarely witnessed. This abandoned sacrifice to vice was destined to present its crowning offering in the conflagration of the temple. Towards daybreak the debauchées had for the most part slunk wearied or stupefied to their dens; about two hundred of the most debased of the professed debauchery remained, staggering about the area, or snorting in exhausted helplessness among the lobbies and passages. It was now about twenty minutes to five, and Professor Anderson thought it time to close the orgie. He accordingly advanced to the orchestra and directed the musicians to perform "God save the Queen," and at the same time ordered the gasman to lower the lights, as signals that the ball was at an end. At this moment the gas-fitter, happening to cast his eyes upwards, saw flames issuing through the cracks of the ceiling, or floor, of the carpenters' workshops, and immediately exclaimed, "God, God! the house is on fire! Get out for your lives!" He turned off the gas entirely, and immediate measures were taken to check the flames if possible, and to clear the theatre. Such is the account given by the officials engaged in the theatre. An occurrence of this nature, so sudden and so patent, could not but become known to several parties simultaneously. The account more generally circulated was, that as a number of persons were standing together near the orchestra, they were startled by the fall from the

'flies' of a pole, or roll of scenery, of which one end was on fire, and which struck and burnt one of them. Another account describes the falling material as a large portion of one of the fly scenes. This startling occurrence caused the spectators to look up, when they saw the roof in flames, and sparks flying about. Their screams and exclamations gave the alarm, and all was instantly terror and confusion.

The few remaining maskers rushed precipitately to the various entrances, of which the police, with ready presence of mind, took immediate possession, and were thus enabled to rescue from the selfish alarm of many of the stronger sex their terror-stricken partners. Several women were trampled on, and some were carried out fainting, but none were seriously injured. There was something hideous in this sudden change from mad revelry to ghastly fear. Already the rush of air towards the roof had fanned the fire into brighter life and fiercer energy. Wreaths of white smoke, with here and there a lambent flame, began to curl from under the proscenium into the body of the theatre. The musicians leapt from their seats and fled, in many cases without even saving their cherished instruments. The interior of the theatre was almost immediately cleared of the visitors. There was no time for thought or plan. The flames rushed forward, and whirling round the interior made it at once their own. The ballet-girls and minor characters of the masque came flying from their dressing-rooms into the passages of the theatre, and were in many instances with difficulty led out into safety by the police; who, mustering speedily and in strong

numbers from the adjoining station, behaved with the greatest coolness and courage. It was now hardly five o'clock, and yet in the few minutes which had elapsed the doom of the theatre had been sealed. The flames had burst through the roof, sending high up into the air columns of fire, which threw into bright reflection every tower and spire within the circuit of the metropolis, brilliantly illuminating the whole fabric of St. Paul's, and throwing a flood of light across Waterloo Bridge, which set out in bold relief the dark outline of the Surrey hills in the distance. This glare operated as a speedy messenger in bringing up the fire-engines, which now proceeded from every quarter of London at a tearing gallop to the scene of the conflagration. There was no want of water; but neither engines nor water were of any avail in saving the property. The theatre blazed within its four hollow walls like a furnace; and at half-past five o'clock the roof fell in with a tremendous crash. Showers of fiery sparks and burning charcoal were thrown up, and then poured down upon the streets, which were crowded with people. At seven o'clock the whole interior of the building had been utterly destroyed, except some of the parting walls; and the whole area of the lately splendid edifice was one blazing and smoking volcano; while along the wall small tongues of flames shot out from among the masonry where timbers had been inserted. The exterior walls remained standing, and in particular the noble front, declared by Canova to be the finest architectural *façade* in London, though stained by water and calcined by the heat, presented the aspect of a pure architectural design—the windows

blank, the statues in the niches, and the entablature and inscriptions perfect. When the engines arrived from every quarter of the metropolis, it was at once evident to the experienced firemen that any attempt to save the theatre would be utterly useless; and that the whole of the houses which faced the four sides of the building were in imminent danger of taking fire. Their chief exertions were therefore directed to save the metropolis from a catastrophe which would probably have been the greatest since the Great Fire. So tremendous was the heat thrown out by the burning mass that the houses on the side of Bow Street opposite the grand entrance—a space of considerable width—were heated and blistered to such an extent, that it was only by an incessant inundation of water that they were prevented from bursting into flames. The houses in Hart Street did take fire and were much damaged; but those in Covent Garden, and those adjoining the theatre on the south suffered little damage. Indeed, it is wonderful that the conflagration did so little mischief beyond the walls; probably the draughts of air rushing through the entrances, passages, and windows as soon as the roof fell in drove the flames upwards within the walls as through a chimney.

The disaster was so sudden in its inception and completion, and occurred at such an hour, that the distant parts of the metropolis were not aroused. The earliest information to most persons was the startling heading in their morning papers of "Destruction of Covent Garden Theatre by Fire;" and thousands drove by through the Strand and Holborn on their way to business without

any notion of the event which had taken place but a few hours before and within a few hundred yards. As the news spread great crowds assembled at the ends of the street, and viewed the smoking ruins with deep interest. Her Majesty, to whom the theatre, as the locality of the most splendid Italian opera London has seen, was especially dear, inspected the ruins in the following afternoon. Her Majesty, who was accompanied by the Princess Royal, was conducted within the walls as far as it was possible to penetrate with safety, and viewed the desolate scene with evident regret. Prince Albert and the Prince of Wales also came to view the destruction, and many of the nobility.

It was at first announced that several persons had perished, but the report proved to be unfounded.

Besides the total destruction of the building, with its magnificent scenery and costly mechanism, "properties" of immense value were consumed. The wardrobe was well known to be of surpassing splendour; the gallery of arms and armour was a magnificent sight. The theatrical library, containing a vast collection of dramatic pieces arranged for performance; a great number of scores of the most popular operas; the original manuscripts of many of our classical dramas; and a collection of dramatic curiosities, unique of its kind, were utterly consumed. Four pictures by Hogarth, representing the Seasons, and which escaped the conflagration of 1808, were again rescued on this occasion. A large portion of the conjuring properties of Mr. Anderson were destroyed; but the treasury chest, containing a large part of

the receipts of the last two days, was carried out in safety. The tradesmen who supplied the masks and fancy dresses, the furniture of the refreshment rooms, and some operatic *artistes* who had left their wardrobes in the care of the property man, lost their respective chattels to a considerable value.

The building was uninsured, no office having been willing to grant a policy after the fire of 1808. Mr. Gye had effected an insurance on his properties to the amount of 8000*l*. Mr. Anderson had insured his machinery for 2000*l*.

A very lengthened inquiry was held by the coroner into the cause of this disaster. The general facts were proved as already narrated. As to the origin of the fire nothing could be ascertained with certainty; but several causes were suggested, any one of which might have been the true one. It is certain that as the stupidity of drunkenness began to prevail among the revellers, many persons commenced smoking, and it was thought that the fire might have originated by the carelessness of some one of these; but although it seems that many persons had availed themselves of the universal licence to penetrate to recesses of the theatre not usually seen by the public, and might have got into the carpenters' shop, the whole circumstances of the outbreak negative the supposition. It was thought very probable that the origin of the fire was to be sought in the great central chandelier. This magnificent illuminator contained 800 burners (fish-tail), of which the highest circle was ten or twelve feet from the floor of the carpenters' shop—the carpenters' shop and painting-room extend over the whole ceiling of

the theatre)—and was suspended from iron girders which spanned an aperture in the ceiling, and the heated air from the lights passed through a shaft in the workshop, and through an immense ventilator in the roof. The shaft was eight feet wide. The burners in the chandelier had been lighted at twelve o'clock of the morning of Monday, and had not been once extinguished to the moment of the outbreak—they had been burnt brilliantly on Monday night, had been turned low when the performance was over, had burnt glimmeringly during the night and following morning, and had been turned on to their fullest extent when the revels of the masked ball commenced. It was reasonably suggested that the fire might have been caused by the long-continued and intense heat arising from the burners. Many circumstances combine to negative this suggestion. It is well known that the draught from the great chandeliers of public buildings is immense; that, beside the air vitiated by combustion, the current draws with it an immense amount of surrounding atmosphere, and is, in fact, the great means of ventilating the space below, and keeping the atmosphere breathable. This operation is performed with such constancy and rapidity that the current never attains that degree of heat—or near it—that is necessary to produce ignition of wood or ordinary substances. This current, moreover, is of different degrees of temperature, the exterior of the column, consisting of the indraught, being of much lower temperature than the inner. Indeed, that a current of air can be heated to a degree sufficient to produce combustion where ample means are

provided for its passing away as it becomes rarified seems sufficiently disproved by the evidence of the carpenters and firemen, who agreed in stating that the woodwork surrounding the shaft was never heated to any high degree, nor the workshop rendered uncomfortable. Neither could the conflagration have been caused by any particular dryness of the woodwork on this occasion, for the heat of the chandelier must have, years gone by, dried the woodwork to the uttermost degree of dryness. No doubt, however, these circumstances had reduced the wood and all other materials around into the fittest possible state for ignition and instantaneous combustion. Another proposition was, that a considerable quantity of gas might have escaped—it was proved that great complaints had been made by the gasmen of the condition of the pipes—and that this gas might have taken fire by contact with a burning light. But this explanation is to be rejected on well-known grounds. The gas of commerce will not burn at all when mixed with any large proportion of atmospheric air; if there had been any excess it must have been carried off continuously by the ventilator; but supposing any accumulation in one spot, and ignition, the consequences would have been a sudden explosion, with great noise and mischief. It was then suggested that the fire had commenced in the carpenters' shop, in which, no doubt, a large quantity of very combustible materials, heated to this ignitable condition, lay about. No evidence could be produced to show any cause for the ignition; but very culpable carelessnesses were proved. The carpenters' shop was accessible

to any one who chose—whether the workmen or strangers—for the key had been lost, and the door had not been locked for some months; and one of the witnesses admitted that he had been to the door with an open candle, and though he denied having entered, circumstances raised suspicion that persons who had gone into the shop had not always taken care to have covered lights. Another explanation, which though suggested received little attention, should be noticed here. One of the Professor's glaring devices for attracting attention was the exhibition of an electric light from the portico of the theatre. The chief materials used in producing this brilliant illumination are sulphuric and nitric acid. The precaution was taken of hoisting the carboys containing these dangerous liquids to the roof of the theatre from the outside; but the wires were carried into one of the boxes, and 15 lbs. or 16 lbs. of the acids had sometimes been in this box. It was, however, stated that the whole apparatus had been since removed. A further suggestion was, that the fire had been caused by the "battens," which appear to be ranges of lights fixed upon pieces of timber, and let down by means of cords from the flies, their duty being to throw that light upon the upper parts of the scenery which the footlights afford to the stage, and which are moveable according to the exigencies of the scenery: it was supposed that one of the ropes, or floating pieces of scenery, had caught fire, that the flames had run up with rapidity and communicated to the flooring. Mr. Braidwood, the experienced superintendent of the London Fire Establishment, was of opinion that

the fire had originated from spontaneous combustion, among the masses of waste stuff accumulated in the workshops—an opinion which was strengthened by the evidence of Mr. Grieve, the celebrated scene-painter, who stated, that on a previous occasion he had called attention to a heap of such materials which had been allowed to gather, and which, when removed by his authority, was found to be so hot as to be unbearable by the hand. The answer to the suggestion may be, that self-ignition is a very slow process, and always preceded by a long smothered heat, with strong and offensive odours; and it was certain that numerous workmen had been in these rooms without perceiving any such symptoms. Mr. Braidwood, indeed, stated that the firemen had been on duty for forty consecutive hours, and were so exhausted that vigilance was impossible. But spontaneous heating would have thrown out its warning effects while the men were yet fresh, and they must have commanded their notice. The only distinct evidence bearing upon the place of origin is the statement of two of the firemen, that when, on the alarm of fire, they rushed into the workshops, they were overcome by a dense black and fetid smoke; but when they had entered on their hands and knees to get at the water-mains, they could perceive that a heap of stuff, lying on the left side of the room, 30 feet from the ventilating shaft, and far removed from any of the gas-burners, was on fire. Whatever may have been the cause of the disaster, it is clear that it was sudden, for one of the firemen who had been up in the flies at three o'clock, and another at a quarter or half-past

four, saw or smelt nothing to give cause for the least uneasiness. The coroner's jury were unable to trace any distinct cause of the fire, and returned a verdict "That the theatre was destroyed by fire on the morning of the 5th March, but how or by what means the fire originated they had no evidence before them to show."

The magnificent theatre which was destroyed by this conflagration was the fourth edifice which had occupied the site. The original theatre in Covent Garden was built by Mr. John Rich, of harlequinade notoriety, and opened on the 7th of December, 1732, with Congreve's *Way of the World*. Various alterations and improvements were made in the edifice in 1782; and in 1792 it was rebuilt from the designs of Henry Holland, architect, at an expense of 25,000*l.*, of which 15,000*l.* was advanced as a loan by the Duke of Bedford, whose successor is the ground landlord. On the night of the 20th of September, 1808, the theatre was burnt to the ground by an accidental fire, which is supposed to have arisen from the ignited wadding of the soldiers' muskets fired off in the play of *Pizarro* lodging among some of the inflammable decorations of the scenery. Twenty-two lives were lost by the fall of the burning roof. The value of the property consumed on that occasion was estimated at 100,000*l.*, and the loss is said to have been covered by insurance to the extent of 75,000*l.* On the 31st of December, 1808, the Prince of Wales laid the first stone of the new theatre; and the house was opened on the 18th of September, 1809. The opening play was *Macbeth*, in which Mrs. Siddons played Lady Macbeth.

But the whole play was performed in dumb show, owing to the riotous behaviour of the audience, who then commenced the celebrated O. P. row, occasioned by the raising of the prices of admission. The expenses of erecting the theatre are said to have amounted to 150,000*l.*; of which 44,550*l.* was received from the insurance-offices, and 50,000*l.* raised by subscription-shares of 500*l.* each. The architect was Sir Robert Smirke; the statues of Tragedy and Comedy, and the two bas-reliefs on the Bow Street front, were by Flaxman. The stage was 55 feet in length and 86 feet in width; the depth from the curtain to the back of the pit was 66 feet; the saloon was 56 feet by 19 feet. The fortunes of the succeeding managers were generally adverse, and the house seemed almost abandoned by the legitimate drama when M. Jullien hired the theatre for his promenade concerts in 1843-5. It was subsequently hired by the Anti-Corn-law League as a lecture-hall. In 1846 the building was entirely remodelled by Mr. Albano, at an expense of nearly 30,000*l.*, under the auspices of Mr. Delafield, for the performance of the Italian Opera. It was opened on the 6th of April, 1847; with such an extravagant expenditure, that in 1848 there was a loss of 34,756*l.*, and in 1849 of 25,455*l.*, Mr. Delafield was speedily and utterly ruined; and the opera seemed as likely to ruin all its undertakers as the drama had done; when the failure and closing of the old Haymarket house threw the whole patronage of the nobility upon the establishment of Mr. Gye, the unquestionable excellence of whose management raised the under-

taking to a high degree of popularity.

The long career of the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden—sometimes prosperous, sometimes ruinous to its managers—had been always glorious in respect of the many admirable dramatic pieces which had been produced on its stage. Many, also, of the greatest of our actors first made their appearances to London audiences on its boards. Braham made his *début* in 1787, on the stage of the old theatre, and after witnessing the destruction of that edifice, just survived to witness the destruction of its more magnificent successor. Incledon appeared in 1790; Charles Kemble, 1794; Mrs. Glover, 1797; G. F. Cooke (Richard III.), Oct. 31, 1800; Miss Stephens (Countess of Essex), 1812; Miss O'Neill (Lady Beecher), 1814; Macready, 1816; W. Farren, 1818; Fanny Kemble, 1829; Adelaide Kemble, 1841. Edmund Kean took his farewell of the stage from these boards in 1833.

Covent Garden is the third theatre which has been burnt down under Mr. Anderson's engagements; the first at New York; the next at Glasgow. The latter is stated to have been his own property.

6. THE SNARESTONE MURDER.—*Leicester*.—John Fowkes, aged 45, labourer, was indicted for the wilful murder of John Acres Fowkes, at Snarestone, on the 25th of November last.

This case was rendered singularly shocking from the circumstance that the murdered man was the murderer's nephew, and that the principal witness against him were his brother and sister. William Fowkes said:—The prisoner

is my elder brother. I have another brother living at Newton. I have two sisters. One, married to a man named Patrick, lives at Snarestone. The other, Elizabeth, lives in my father's house. She has been married, but is now a widow. She had children before she was married. John Acres Fowkes, the deceased, was her illegitimate son. He also resided with my father, and so did Thomas Atkins, who is another of Elizabeth's children. Those three were all that lived with my father, and formed his family. My father occupied a farm at Snarestone, near the church. He was about 80 years old, his health was bad in November last, and he died two months ago. I and the prisoner worked upon the farm as labourers. John Acres also. The prisoner had been a butcher about seven years before, and he was generally called "butcher." I managed the farm principally. John Acres managed the accounts. I lived in the village. The prisoner lived at an old house on the farm, about half a mile from my father's house. On Sunday, November 25th, I went to my father's early in the morning, and again about 2 or 3 in the afternoon. At that time John Acres was at home, but he afterwards went out and left me with my father. About 9 in the evening the prisoner came. He called me out. He had dark clothes on, but not like the black coat which he has on now. He said to me, "John Acres has got 700*l.* of my father's money." I said, "No such thing." He said, "Brown at the Elephant has told me so, and Stephen Tebutt, too." I said, "You must not believe what they tell you; but I'll tell you as nigh as can be

what John Acres has got of father's money." I said, "100*l.* as I know'd to." He said, "I will be — if he hasn't got 700*l.*, and I'll be — if I don't stop him this night." He followed me into the house, and stood a minute or two talking to my father. He then went out, and bade us good night. I remained till Acres came back, about half-past 11. Cooper, a policeman, came with him. My sister and Atkins had gone to bed. We had some ale together. I sat nearest to the window at the side of the room, about a yard and a-half from it. Cooper sat next me, and Acres next, and my father was on the sofa. My father got up and went to the side window. There was an outside shutter, fastened by a cotter within. My father "uncottered" the window, and opened it, and shoved the shutter back. He waited there about three minutes. It was moonlight, the moon about the full. He closed the window, but not the shutter. My father was returning to the sofa, when I heard a crash at the window. I turned to look, and hooted, "There's 'butcher.'" I saw his face at the window, but I didn't see him plain. He was standing still outside. I aren't able to tell who it was, not certainly. I could not tell his size. While I was hooting the gun went off. I hooted very loud, but only once. He was close to the shutter, or thereabouts. It was only open about eight inches.

Lord Campbell: What made you hoot?

Witness: I saw him at the window. I had not observed anything. I saw his face. I thought myself by the appearance of it that it was "butcher's" face.

Lord Campbell: Did you see the face of the man?

Witness: Yes; it was very light at that time. I have a belief that it was the "butcher." I believe it was. I now believe it, from what I then saw. I heard the gun go off, and then he went away. We heard him run by the window through the garden towards the park. I said, "He's a dead man," meaning Acres. I ran to the kitchen door. I could not open it. It was fastened outside. I went back, and we laid Acres on the floor. I took a knife and pulled the door, while Cooper cut the rope with which it had been fastened. We got into the yard. We could not see or hear anybody. I should think it was five minutes before we got out. We ascertained that the door had been fastened with a pole across the door, tied to the handle by rope. The garden-gate leading into the park was found open. Acres lived till the following Thursday.

Upon cross-examination the witness stated that the shutter was always closed at dusk, and that when his father opened it, it still covered the greater part of the window; that he did not see any gun; that Cooper would not, where he was sitting, have so good a view of the window as the witness had; that he saw the face when he hooted, and heard the report at the same moment.

The statement of this witness was confirmed by Cooper, the policeman; except that Cooper saw nothing when William Fowkes hooted, "There's 'butcher' at the window." He stated that he had not time to look before the gun went off.

The further evidence adduced in support of the charge was en-

tirely circumstantial. The mother of the deceased, drawn to the window by the report, had seen a man in a crouching posture going towards a ploughed field beyond. In that field, footprints were found, which corresponded with boots found in the prisoner's house. Similar footprints were also found near to the carpenter's shop, whence the pole had been taken with which the kitchen door was fastened. On the following morning the prisoner's house was searched, and a gun found there, as well as some shot and caps and powder. The gun had a peculiar adjustment of the trigger, which could be put into order in a few minutes by one who understood it; but the prisoner attempted to pass it off as a useless weapon, although it exhibited all the usual signs of having been recently discharged. Two gunsmiths were examined, who stated that the gun was one of very rough construction, but one which could, without difficulty, be fired off by a person who understood it. Inside the barrel they had observed a graze or scratch, which, in the opinion of both of them, could not have been made by common shot, but must have been made by some hard substance, as stone or iron. This evidence was important from the circumstance that upon the *post-mortem* examination of the body of the deceased, the surgeon had extracted from the wound in the head, besides five small shot, several bits of brick or stone. The shot found in the prisoner's house was ascertained to be of the same weight as that which had been extracted from a window-sill of the room in which the deceased was shot.

It was also given in evidence,

that the prisoner had frequently of late used expressions, in reference to the deceased, which inferred a determination to make away with him; and that the motive was jealousy, that the lad would have all the old man's money. The conduct of the prisoner, when apprehended, was nervous and conscious, and he attempted to throw suspicion on his brother William, saying, "I was not likely to do that, I am very fond of him; but my brother Bill is a bad one."

Mr. O'Brien addressed the jury for the prisoner, contending that the jury could not, with any safety, act upon the doubtful belief of William Fowkes—a belief founded upon a mere momentary glance; and that, independently of his evidence, the case rested upon circumstances not satisfactorily proved, and, even if proved, too slight and insignificant in themselves to warrant a conviction. As to the footmarks, there was, first of all, nothing remarkable about the boots; the jury would hesitate before they came to the conclusion that the footprints seen in the ploughed field had been made by the prisoner's boots; but, if they were satisfied with that, the fact was of very little importance, because the prisoner was employed upon the farm, and his footprints might be found anywhere about the farm without affording any just ground of suspicion against him. Neither was the possession of a poacher's gun a circumstance of any weight against him; for, in the first place, it was not even proved that the deceased was killed by a gun-shot. Nobody saw the weapon by which the injury was inflicted, and all that was known about it was, that it was some de-

scription of fire-arms. Then, as to the expressions of ill-will, he rather relied upon them as indicating the absence of any intention to commit any serious crime. As to the threatening expressions used by the prisoner, they rather pointed to innocence than to guilt; for no man in his senses would proclaim his intention to commit murder and then go and do it. It was clear that there were great disputes in the family, and these expressions were such as were commonly made use of under such circumstances, and therefore afforded no presumption of guilt.

The jury found the prisoner *Guilty*, and he was sentenced to be hanged. Upon hearing his doom he exclaimed, with earnestness, "My Lord, I am innocent of this crime."

The case was not so clear but that the prisoner might have room to hope that he should avoid the last penalty of the law, and under this conviction he for some time kept up the appearance of indifference. But as the fatal term approached his nerves gave way, and he confessed his guilt, adding, "that he intended to have shot his brother Bill if he could have got them both in a line." Nor did he altogether fail in this design, for some of the shot struck his brother in the head. After his confession the prisoner paid more attention to his religious duties, and died with decent penitence.

6. MURDER BY A CONVICT—*Winchester*. — Thomas Jones was indicted for the wilful murder of Charles William Hope, on board the *Stirling Castle* convict hulk at Portsmouth.

Mr. Coleridge, counsel for the Crown, said, that the prisoner at the bar was a convict on board the

Stirling Castle, which was an invalid ship in Portsmouth Harbour. The unfortunate gentleman who had been murdered, Mr. Hope, was the surgeon in charge of the health of the convicts on board that ship. It appeared that the prisoner had been, for some disease he had upon him, under medical treatment by Mr. Hope, that he had got better of the disease by which he had been attacked, and Mr. Hope had removed him from the lower deck to a place in the ship called the "class," the difference being that in the lower deck the convicts had beds and were exempted from work, while in the "class" they slept in hammocks, and were compelled to do certain portions of work. The prisoner resented this alteration, and more than once requested Mr. Hope to place him on the lower deck; but Mr. Hope declined to do so. On the 8th of February the prisoner came to the surgery where Mr. Hope was engaged, and asked Mr. Hope to examine him with a view to his being replaced on the lower deck. Mr. Hope examined him, and then told him that he saw no reason for placing him below. The prisoner said Mr. Hope was biassed by Mr. Williams. Mr. Hope told him he was quite mistaken; and it did not appear that he anticipated any violence, as he quietly left the surgery. The prisoner followed him. Mr. Hope went into a gallery which went round the chapel of the ship, and in that gallery the prisoner seized Mr. Hope with the left hand, and with the right hand struck him one single blow on the neck, having something in his hand. That blow was the death-blow to Mr. Hope; it cut through his neckcloth, through a shawl

wrapper, and into the jugular vein. Mr. Hope went some little distance into a room of the ship. He sat down upon a chair, but fell from it, and in five minutes from the time of receiving the blow he ceased to live. There had been no provocation—no quarrel; the blow was struck in perfectly cold blood. So far from the prisoner having shown any regret or remorse or sorrow for what he had done, he said the only thing he regretted was that instead of having had Mr. Hope only he had not had the whole of the medical staff of the ship. He also said that he did not regret what he had done, and that if he had twenty lives he was ready to give them up. He again and again avowed that he had done it, and he gloried in what he had done; he had determined if Mr. Hope did not comply with his request to remove him to the lower deck, to put an end to his life. He said he had obtained one of the common knives of the ship, and before he used it he had taken care deliberately to sharpen it; but the prisoner had been placed in a cell in which there was a convenience which communicated with the water, and the knife, therefore, had not been found.

The evidence proved the facts stated by the counsel.

Mr. Saunders addressed the jury for the prisoner, urging upon them that at the moment of the act the prisoner was acting under a delusion that he had been ill-treated by some persons, and that his mind was in such a state that he was impelled irresistibly to commit this act, and therefore was not responsible for his conduct. The learned gentleman, however, called no witnesses to support his suggestion.

The jury immediately found the prisoner *Guilty*, and he was executed on the 22nd instant. After sentence, this convict, a criminal from his birth, appears to have shown a real sorrow for his crime. The murder, however, forced the attention of the Government to the discipline of these convict hulks, which have long borne a most evil report, as dens of unspeakable wickedness and misery.

7. EXPLOSION OF THE HATTON POWDER MILLS, HOUNSLOW.—The Hounslow Powder Mills consist of many detached buildings, scattered over a considerable space, in which the operations are as much separated as practicable, in order to avoid extreme disaster. On the evening of the 7th instant, two men named Edwards and Holt, and a youth named Walker, were employed in “the mixing house” of the Hatton Mills. About half-past six, they were engaged in mixing sulphur and nitre, when Edwards opened the door of the building, and before he had closed it, was seen to open his lanthorn, for the purpose, it is conjectured, of extinguishing the light. The man Holt, who happened to be nearest to him at the time, stated before he died, that at that moment he observed a spark to fly from the lanthorn towards the mixing house; an explosion instantly followed, the buildings were shattered to pieces, and the unfortunate men were blown away. Walker and Holt were found in a booth on the premises so dreadfully burnt and injured, that they died after great suffering; and Edwards was found in the brook, under water and quite dead. It appeared that the men worked in the mixing house night and day, and that the lights were oil lamps. The only precau-

tion taken against accident was the order of the employers, that the men should never open or trim the lamps within the buildings. Under these circumstances, and with the known carelessness of the men, the only wonder was, that no accident had occurred for twenty-eight years.

10. STRANGE AND FATAL DUEL AT BERLIN.—A duel, very strange to English notions, and which has been the subject of discussion all over Europe, has been fought at Berlin. The precise cause of the meeting—or murder, as many termed it—is not perfectly certain. Herr von Hinckeldy, a gentleman who had been connected with the revolutionary party in Prussia in 1848, had, on the suppression of the disturbances, become a faithful and active servant of the Prussian sovereign. He had been charged with the organisation of the central police existing at Berlin. His activity in the exercise of his office had made him a subject of fear and dread to the indisposed of both parties—and his severity was aggravated in the eyes of both the revolutionists and royalists by his political antecedents. It is related by travellers, that the nobility of Prussia have never recovered the subjugation of their order by the Emperor Napoleon; that despoiled of their wealth they are of small influence in the State, and that, isolated by their rank and poverty from the general mass, they attach themselves with inordinate pride to their titular rank and their pedigrees. Naturally a poor and proud aristocracy are idle; and travellers say that among their ranks are an unusually large number of dissipated, reckless, and fierce young men. Among the objects which

had come within the cognizance of the Director of the Police, was a certain Jockey Club, of which the members were chiefly young men of rank and of no good repute. His interference raised the hatred of the members to the highest pitch—it had the character of an epidemic frenzy. Insults of a most shameful character were offered to the detested official at every opportunity and by every means. The unfortunate man's life was rendered perfectly miserable. He wished to resign his post; but the King of Prussia, a most amiable and accomplished man, but irresolute, valued his services too highly, and refused to accept his resignation. Unfortunately it does not appear that he took any step to prevent or discountenance the insulting conduct exhibited towards him. After a certain step had been taken by the Director of Police in regard to the Jockey Club, an interview had taken place between that official and members of the club, in which the former made a statement to M. von Rochow, a young nobleman, which the latter repeated or professed to repeat to others, and they again to their friends. The Director disavowed the statement as reported; upon which M. von Rochow affected to consider himself to be placed under the imputation of lying, and his friends also considered themselves (by descent, apparently) to have some share of the taint. The Club were furious, and such further insults were offered to M. von Hinckeldy, that that unfortunate gentleman could no longer bear his position, and although he knew that his death was certain, resigned his post, and sent a challenge to M. von Rochow. This young man is said to have been one of the most reckless

of all the members of the Club; he was a soldier, and well acquainted with the use of arms. That the duel was about to take place was as well known to the Berlin public, as the celebrated Irish duels of the last generation were known to the Dublin public. The King was officially informed of it, and "pronounced strongly against the duel;" but instead of taking steps to prevent it, ordered his informer to collect all the materials that could throw light upon the affair; he even ordered him to take a journey into Silesia to take depositions. In the meanwhile the duel had taken place, and M. von Hinckeldy was of course killed. This is the account of the murder given by the "umpire:" "As soon as the gentlemen were placed I gave the signal for the duel to commence. Both gentlemen advanced with short strides towards the barrier, and both taking aim. Herr von Hinckeldy first pulled trigger, but the pistol hung fire. Herr von Rochow immediately lowered his pistol. As soon as another pistol had been handed to Herr von Hinckeldy, both gentlemen taking aim, advanced again simultaneously towards the barrier until both were about twelve good paces from it, whereupon both fired so nearly at the same instant that only a person standing near could distinguish the two shots, for others who were standing twenty paces off heard only one report. The duel was consequently fought in conformity with all the requirements of honour and with the laws of combat by duel." M. de Rochow was not touched, but M. de Hinckeldy fell stone dead, the ball having entered his side and pierced his heart. The second of M. Hinckeldy immediately left for Charlottenburg to

acquaint the King of the fatal event. His Majesty was greatly affected and shed tears! In the meanwhile, the murderer was showing himself openly the hero of the day, and was holding *levées* at his house. In the Chamber of Peers, Prince Hohenlohe, the President, was compelled to notice the subject; he had not a word of pity for the murdered public servant, but he spoke with much sympathy of the situation of the Member of the Chamber, which he represented as one of great misfortune. It seems very probable, that M. von Rochow would have escaped without punishment, had not the public opinion of Europe exhibited so much astonishment and horror, that the Prussian Court and nobility were compelled to pay some homage to it, and M. von Rochow was put on his trial, condemned and sentenced to five years imprisonment in the fortress of Stettin.

When this noble criminal had suffered about a year's detention, he was pardoned on the petition of the widow of M. de Hinckeldy, who stated as the grounds of her request, the sufferings of the prisoner's mother.

12. FIRE AT MESSRS. SCOTT RUSSELL'S SHIP YARD, MILLWALL. —In the afternoon a destructive fire broke out in the extensive ship-building yard of Messrs. Scott Russell and Co., Millwall.

The premises in which the disaster commenced contained the most valuable machinery of the concern. The lower floor was occupied by a saw-mill which had cost several thousand pounds; and the floors above contained the steam planing mills and joinery, all fitted with machinery of great value.

The workmen were at work in the yard, when smoke and flames were seen to issue from several parts of this building. The men made every exertion, with the means at hand, which include a private fire-engine, to check the flames: but in vain, for it was not until a strong force of the fire-brigade had arrived from different stations in London, that the conflagration could be got under. The whole of the workshops referred to, with their valuable machinery and stock, were destroyed. This was the third fire which had occurred on these premises since 1854.

On the following afternoon a fire occurred in the soap and candle factory of Mr. Buckland, East Street, Walworth. From the inflammable nature of the stock, the flames raged with great fury; nor could the water thrown on them produce any abatement, but rather floated the burning fat and tallow to other premises. It seemed likely, therefore, that the neighbourhood was about to suffer extensively. Happily, the exertions of the fire-brigade confined the fire to the premises in which it broke out.

14. SUICIDE FROM THE WHISPERING GALLERY OF ST. PAUL'S.—A strange suicide was committed within the cathedral church of St. Paul's, soon after the conclusion of the morning service, and while some of the congregation were yet lingering within the edifice. It appears that between eleven and twelve o'clock a respectably-dressed man paid the vergers the fee for admission to the whispering gallery; before passing up-stairs he left his overcoat and walking-stick in charge of the vergers. Nothing

remarkable or eccentric was observed in his demeanour. He waited in the gallery until the clock had struck twelve; and then mounted the railing, gave three hysterical laughs, crying out each time "Ah! ah! ah!" and before the attendant vergers could reach him, he leaped from the railing into the space below the dome. The depth to the pavement below is 150 feet, and consequently when the officers and strangers came to his assistance he was found to be dreadfully injured and insensible, if not quite dead. When the nearest surgeon arrived life was quite extinct. The unfortunate man had received a compound fracture of the left shoulder, both legs and one arm were broken, the spine was dislocated and the head broken in. The unhappy man was recognised to be a Mr. Alexander Smart, formerly an extensive watch and clock maker, but now retired from business. He had for some time been subject to occasional derangement, and had once before attempted to commit suicide by shooting himself in the head.

14. THE RUGELEY MURDERS: CONVICTION OF THE POSTMASTER.—At the Stafford Assizes, Samuel Cheshire, late postmaster at Rugeley, was indicted for having, in violation of his duty, opened a letter which had come to his hands in that capacity.

This case afforded a remarkable example of the strong partisan feeling which actuated many persons in Staffordshire in favour of William Palmer, and which is referred to in the volume of last year. While the investigation into the death of Mr. Cook was proceeding before the coroner, it was thought

indispensable that an analysis of the contents of the stomach should be made by eminent chemists; and a portion was therefore sent to Professor Taylor, in London. After some time it got rumoured in the town that Palmer was quite safe—that no arsenic or any other poison had been found in the stomach of Cook—and Palmer himself wrote a note to the coroner (whose strange conduct in the execution of his office has been already noticed), stating the fact in exulting terms. The prevalence and accuracy of the report struck Mr. Gardner, the attorney engaged in the case, who had sent the stomach to Dr. Taylor, and who had actually received a letter from the latter and Dr. Owen Rees precisely to the same effect, as somewhat extraordinary; but when the contents of Palmer's letter to the coroner became known, the phrases used were so close to those used in the letter that it was evident there was foul play somewhere; and there was no difficulty in tracing that foul play to the postmaster. The latter did not attempt to deny his offence, and made to an official of the Post Office a statement, which is given at length, as it will show how completely William Palmer had got the persons around him under his influence.

“I went to Palmer's house about half-past eight o'clock on the morning of the 5th December with his letters. He was in bed. I went to his bed-room. He said, ‘Well, have you seen or heard anything?’ and I told him I had seen a letter, and that they had found no poisons. He said he knew they would not, and that he was as innocent as a baby. I saw

Palmer on the Sunday previous to the 5th December. He came to the office, and, according to my belief, said, ‘If you see or hear anything, let me know.’ It was then well known in Rugeley that the contents of the stomach of the deceased had been sent to Dr. Taylor. I thought that Palmer's observations must refer to the correspondence between Dr. Taylor and Gardner, the solicitor. I said, ‘I dare not open anything.’ I believe he said, very coolly, ‘Oh, don't let me persuade you to do anything to injure yourself.’ I believe that was all the conversation which took place, and he then left. That was about five o'clock in the evening. He came to the front door of the house. On the following morning, Monday, Dec. 3, I went to Palmer's house after breakfast, between eight and nine o'clock, with his letters. There were not more than one or two. He asked me if I had heard anything fresh. I told him I had not. He was in bed, and said he was very unwell. I did not see him on Sunday at all. On the morning of Wednesday, the 5th December, I found, on opening the London bag, a letter addressed to Mr. Gardner in an envelope, which was open, and my attention was called to it more particularly by observing on the enclosure of it the words ‘cause of death.’ I believe these were the words. I then took the enclosure from the envelope and cast my eye over it, and the signature of Dr. Taylor at the bottom struck my attention. I returned the enclosure to the envelope, and wetted the gum on the seal and secured it. I then put the letter into the Wednesford box, into which Mr. Gardner's let-

ters are sorted, and subsequently it was despatched to him in his bag. On further recollection I think I mentioned the word strychnine to Mr. Palmer. I don't recollect naming prussic acid."

The prisoner was found guilty, and sentenced to one year's imprisonment.

15. ROBBERY OF THE ROYAL NURSERY PLATE. — The Royal Household is under the supreme control of the Lord Steward; in the department of that sublime functionary is a sub-department of "The Silver Pantry," and the Silver Pantry hath three Yeomen of the Silver Pantry, one Groom of the Silver Pantry, and six assistants. There are materials live and dead, porters, horses, grooms, *fourgons*, carts innumerable, at the disposal of the Lord Steward. But when the Royal nursery plate was to be sent to Windsor, this immense and well-paid establishment could not be turned to such common uses. The Royal plate was confided to a common carrier; and not one yeoman nor one assistant was sent to see that the common carrier did his duty. The common carrier and his men, after the common fashion, stopped at a public-house on their way to have a drink. They were absent, of course, "only five minutes;" but when they came out their charge was absent for ever. A light cart had drawn up to their waggon, the canvas was lifted, and when the common carrier proposed to deliver his freight at Windsor, a box—the box containing the Royal nursery plate—was wanting. The plate-chest was found in Bonner's Fields, but its bullion had long before been converted into "white soup." There was a certain air of

cool impudence in the whole business. The chest contained all the knife-blades and other worthless articles, and all the packing. The exposure was laughable enough. The packing had been done with women's dresses.

15. CATASTROPHE ON THE DELAWARE. — A terrible disaster occurred to one of the Camden and Philadelphia steam ferry boats plying across the Delaware River. The boat had left the former place for Camden with nearly a hundred passengers, mostly residents of New Jersey. The river seems to have been beset with ice, and the passage consequently slow. Before they had cleared the city it was discovered that the vessel was on fire near the smoke-stack. A scene of wild confusion ensued, all in frantic excitement struggling to gain those points from which they could most readily pass to the shore. Unhappily, when the vessel was about thirty feet from the wharf, the fire consumed the steering apparatus, and the current carried the vessel from the shore. Her frantic passengers lost all presence of mind, and threw themselves tumultuously into the water. Some got upon flakes of ice, others were rescued by small boats from the shore. Thirty were drowned.

— UNIVERSITY BOAT RACE. — The perpetual contest between the two ancient Universities for the mastery of the river was continued this year by a race of uncommon power and endurance. For several successive years the palm has remained to Oxford, who won the last great match in 1854. Cambridge was consequently the challenger. The course was from Mortlake to Putney—the reverse

of the usual direction. Although the day was bitterly cold, the river was covered by steam-boats and row-boats of every size, a large body of horsemen accompanied the boats on the towing path, and a very large concourse of pedestrians lined the banks. The Cambridge men, who had the choice, took the Middlesex side. Although the Oxonians got the start, the Cambridge boat shortly overtook them, and had a slight advantage, and this they maintained throughout, although the Oxonians by strenuous spurts sometimes brought themselves equal; and finally, the Cambridge men won the race by about the length of their boat. The victors seem to have been the more powerful, and were certainly the heavier men.

16. BIRTH OF THE IMPERIAL PRINCE.—The event so important to the fortunes of the Napoleonic dynasty and to the future of France, was this day happily accomplished by the birth of an heir to the French throne. The Empress Eugenie was seized with the pains of childbirth about 5 o'clock in the morning of Saturday. The great functionaries of State were immediately summoned to the palace. The Empress upon this occasion experienced more than the usual suffering attendant on the original curse, her labour being severe and protracted. It continued for twenty-two hours, and was not terminated until 3.15 A.M. on the following morning, when all anxiety and danger were over, and Her Majesty gave birth to a male child. It has been whispered that during some part of the labour, it was necessary to have recourse to the appliances of art, and that much anxiety was felt both for the mother and child.

Whether this was really so, or that the flatterers of the Imperial race thought it necessary that there should be a parallelism between the birth of this prince and that of the heir of the great Emperor, it is certain that the child proved strong and healthy, and that the mother experienced no permanent debility from her sufferings. The birth of the Imperial Prince was announced to the world by a salute of 101 guns, and the intelligence was received with great enthusiasm. The most distinguished of the French society thronged to the palace to offer their congratulations. The Representatives of the Foreign Powers necessarily presented their gratulations, and there can be no question that in the case of some of the Powers they were given with heartfelt sincerity.

20. CONFIRMATION OF THE PRINCESS ROYAL.—The ceremony of the confirmation of the Princess Royal, the eldest child of Her Majesty, took place this day in the private chapel of Windsor Castle.

The Princess was led into the chapel by her father, and was followed by the King of the Belgians, the godfather (who had come over to this country to be present), and by Her Majesty. The Royal Children and most of the members of the Royal Family were present; the Ministers, great Officers of State, the members of the Household, and many of the Nobility were invited to attend.

The Bishop of Oxford, (Lord High Almoner) read the preface, and the Archbishop of Canterbury performed the ceremony. The Bishop of Chester (Clerk of the Closet), the Dean of Windsor (Resident Chaplain to the Queen),

and other clergy were seated within the rail.

20. CHILD - MURDER. — *Exeter*. — Mary Weeks was indicted for the wilful murder of George Weeks, on the 3rd of January.

It appeared from the evidence, that on Monday the 7th of January, a fisherman returning from Teignmouth to Topsham saw something floating on the water. He approached it, and found it to be the dead body of a child between 3 and 4 years of age. The child was clearly proved to be the illegitimate child of the prisoner. She had had a previous child, also illegitimate; but notwithstanding was about to be married to a man named Warren, to whom this fact was communicated. The prisoner went to live with Warren until the banns should be published. Shortly afterwards the prisoner produced the deceased child. Warren was very angry, said she had deceived him, and refused to marry her. He left the lodgings, and on the 3rd of January sent the prisoner a message to take away the child before night. She accordingly took away the child that afternoon, saying she was about to take it to the Okehampton Inn to send it by the carrier to her mother. That evening she was seen near the Weir, leaning against a tree, in great distress. At the foot of the tree was found a child's frock. The child had not been sent to her mother's.

The only peculiar part of the case was a statement made by the prisoner while in gaol.

A woman, named Davey, said:— I was in gaol, having been convicted of stealing some articles. The prisoner was brought into the gaol, and was placed in the same cell with me. She seemed in a

great deal of trouble. I asked her what was the matter. She said, "I am thinking of the drowning of my child." I said, "Good God! What! have you done it?" The prisoner said, "I will tell you. I was living at the Bude Hotel. I was keeping company with a man named Warren. I said to him, 'Warren, I am a mother, but not a wife.' He said, 'That's best known to yourself. Mary, if you treat my children kindly, I will treat yours the same.' I left my place to get married, and I went to Warren's house the night I left. During the time the banns were up he was taken ill. My mother came and said to Warren, 'Are you aware that Mary has a child?' He said, the quicker it was brought home the better he should be pleased. My mother afterwards brought the child, and said, 'Warren, I hope you will use it well.' After the child had been there a little time, I thought he did not use it kindly. When we were in bed one night Warren said, 'Mary, yours is a very dirty child; it shall not stop here.' I said, 'My God, Warren, what am I to do with it?' He said, 'Mary, I don't care what you do with it, it shall not stop here. There are many children drowned and it is not found out.' I said, 'My God, Warren, do you mean that I should drown the child?' He said, 'I don't care what you do with it, it shall not stop here. It will be a trouble to you all your life. The best place you can drown it at is Countess Weir.' When I came home one day he said to me, 'Mary, are you going to do it now?' I said, 'Yes, I suppose I must.'" The witness said she then said to the prisoner, "And did you go?" The prisoner said, "Yes; I went to the Countess Weir, and

took part of the clothes off and threw them between the trees." The witness said, "Did you throw it in?" The prisoner said, "No;" and then she showed the witness in what manner she had placed the child in the water. The witness said, "Did the poor little thing struggle much?" The prisoner said, "No, it was asleep." She then went home and told Warren she had done it, and told him where. Warren said, "Mary, you have done it too near, I am afraid it will be found out." The prisoner then lay down by him and said she had nothing to do now but pray to God to forgive her for what she had done. She at first told me not to tell any one what I had told her, but when I was about to leave the prison she asked me to do her a favour, and that was to tell the superintendent of police what she had told me; and the same day I left the prison I gave information.

The counsel for the Crown produced numerous witnesses in support of the case he had stated in his address.

The counsel for the prisoner attempted to struggle against both the evidence and the prisoner's statement. He said the narrative of the witness Davey was not to be believed; and that the evidence adduced by the Crown did not prove death by drowning; that the evidence was quite consistent with other causes and with other circumstances.

The jury, after brief consideration, found a verdict of "Guilty," but recommended her to mercy, on the ground that she had been tempted to commit the act by Warren.

The learned Judge passed sentence of death: and the prisoner's

counsel then moved for a stay of execution on the ground that the prisoner was quick with child. A jury of matrons was immediately impannelled; and they found that the fact was so. The sentence was consequently respited.

24. TWO SHERIFFS FINED.—The time-honoured custom, that the Sheriff of each county shall conduct Her Majesty's Judges into the assize towns with great pomp and circumstance, has for some time been falling into disregard. In one respect the change is natural, for the old fashion of javelin-men, guards, and trumpeters, has fallen into that state of decay that the exhibition has become shabby and ludicrous, and the Sheriff may well be ashamed to offer and the Judge to accept the escort of such a ragged regiment. The excuse made by a Sheriff for the absence of a trumpeter—that the said trumpeter had gone to receive the elephant at the other end of the town—is well known. But the appliances of modern life afford ample means for receiving Her Majesty's officers with becoming state and dignity; and the duty has been enforced on two occasions during the Spring Assizes. At Carmarthen Mr. Justice Williams inflicted a fine of 100*l.* on Major Rice, the High Sheriff, for his neglect. In this case it is just to say that Major Rice excused his conduct by illness. At Bury St. Edmunds, Chief Justice Jervis imposed a similar penalty on the High Sheriff of Suffolk. This punishment seems to have been well deserved; for the conduct complained of was adopted in compliance with the rules of a society composed of gentlemen who are eligible for this honourable office, and which seemed to be

framed on the principle of removing its charges from their own shoulders to those of the county rate-payers. The High Sheriff had provided every accommodation for the Judges, but had failed to attend with the retinue proper to the occasion, and which the law requires; and instead of providing proper persons to keep order in and about the Courts, had directed that the county police should be employed on that duty, and should be paid by the county.

24. TOTAL LOSS OF THE PACIFIC AND ALL ON BOARD.—No doubt can longer exist that the magnificent steamer, *Pacific*, one of the fleet of the Collins line of mail steamers running between Liverpool and New York, has perished with every soul on board. The *Pacific* was built by the company formed in the United States to compete with the English Cunard line. She was of 2800 tons burden, and of 800 horse-power, and was fitted with every appliance for successful competition that American enterprise could suggest. She left Liverpool on the 23rd January, having on board 25 first-class passengers, 20 second-class, and a crew of 141 men—almost all were Americans. She carried also a large and valuable cargo, and a mail. The insurances on her amounted to 2,000,000 dollars. She has never since been heard of, nor has any article of furniture or luggage been picked up which could give any indication of her fate. No one doubts that she struck suddenly on an iceberg and foundered with everything on board. Among the passengers by the *Pacific* were Elliot Warburton and Mr. Catherwood, whose researches and drawings in Central America and in the East are of great value. The *Pacific* is the second

ship of the Collins line which has perished on the seas; the first being the *Arctic*, which was sunk by a collision with a French steamer in Nov. 1854. Other great steam-ships have disappeared like the *Pacific*, on their route between England and the United States, and left no trace behind. The *President* was missed in 1841, and the *City of Glasgow* in 1854, and not the slightest indication of their fate has ever been discovered. Among the passengers of the former were Lord Fitzroy Lennox, son of the Duke of Richmond, and Tyrone Power, the celebrated Irish actor. The latter had on board 480 persons, mostly emigrants, many of them of a very superior class.

26. MURDER BY A GERMAN LEGIONARY.—At the Bodmin Assizes, Hans Hansen was put to the bar, charged with the wilful murder of Charles Jacobi, at Maker, on the 13th of March. The prisoner, who is a Dane, is a mild, inoffensive-looking man. He declined a jury *de medietate linguæ*, and elected to be tried by an English jury. The prisoner and the murdered man were both soldiers in the German Legion, which at the time in question was quartered at Maker, near Plymouth. The last time the deceased man was seen was in company with the prisoner at the bar, in a field in the parish of Maker, about 8 o'clock at night, after which time he was not seen alive. Both the parties when last seen were considerably intoxicated. The prisoner at that time was carrying a large stone. The next morning the corpse of the man Charles Jacobi was found in a field. Near the corpse was a hedge, and some short distance from it a large stone was found with blood and brains and hair upon it. That stone was

the same sort of stone, and resembled generally the stone the prisoner had been seen carrying. The prisoner came into the barracks that night very late—about 12 o'clock, when he ought to have been there at 8. When he came to the barracks he was in an excited state, and there was a good deal of blood about him, and his clothes were stained with blood. He was asked on two different occasions to account for the blood, and on both gave different accounts which were inconsistent with each other, and one of them was not at all probable or likely; and before anything was said of the death of Jacobi, and before he could have heard of it, upon being asked what had become of Jacobi, his answer was, "I did not kill him." At that time nothing had been said to lead his mind to the idea that he or any one was accused of having murdered Jacobi. The body of the murdered man was found the next morning, by a peasant going to his work, in the field in which he and prisoner had been last seen together. The man fetched the sergeant, who recognised the unfortunate man. The head was covered with blood; there was a wound behind the left ear; the clothes were not soiled, but there was a footmark on the breast. A military cap was lying about two feet from the body, but it could not be shown to whom it belonged. Jacobi's belt was on a hedge about 14 feet from the body. A stone produced in court—a very large mass—was found covered with grass; there was blood and hair upon it. In the pocket of the deceased were 3s. 4d., a tobacco pipe and box, and a cigar. The pipe was broken. The pocket was under the footmark on the left breast.

The regimental surgeon, who examined the body, stated that he found three wounds—one above the left ear, one below it, and one on the left lower jaw. The skull was found to be fractured just above the left ear; the cheek-bone was entirely forced out of the socket, the lower part of the left jawbone was fractured. There were other injuries. Death was caused by the injuries he had described. The injuries must have been inflicted with a heavy blunt instrument; the stone produced was just such an instrument as would produce them. There was human hair on the stone; it was very much like the hair of the deceased. He had examined the prisoner, and had found no wounds or scratches upon his person. The flat end of a large hammer might cause such wounds; a heavy bludgeon would not.

The prisoner's counsel urged in his defence, that this was entirely a case of circumstantial evidence, and this evidence had failed. No one circumstance had been distinctly brought forward which identified the prisoner with the murder. The chief circumstance which connected the prisoner with the murder was the circumstance of his having been seen with a stone under his arm, and this stone, covered with human hair and human blood, having been found near the dead body. Now it could hardly be supposed, that the prisoner would have carried about this stone, which weighed 16 lbs., all the evening, for the purpose of murdering his comrade. There was, however, no proof that the hair was human hair; and no test had been applied to the blood. The jury could not, therefore, assume that the hair and blood were human. There was no proof that the stone was the in-

strument of murder; the surgeon had told them that the flat end of a hammer would have caused the same wounds. Far less was there any proof of murder. If he had murdered his comrade, he would not have come to the barracks with blood on his hands and clothes; he was intoxicated and looked wild; it was by no means clear that he had not been told by some of those who arrested him, that he was arrested for the murder of Jacobi; if he had been told, it would account for his exclamation, while, if the unhappy event had been brought on by a sudden quarrel, he would naturally hasten to excuse himself of murder. The circumstances of his having carried the stone about while evidently on friendly terms with the deceased, of his having, even while drunk, made the exculpatory exclamations given in evidence, and that the money and articles remained untouched in the pocket of the deceased, clearly pointed to a crime of a less degree than murder.

The jury, after a deliberation of several hours, returned a verdict of "Guilty."

Mr. Justice Crowder passed sentence of death, holding out no hope of mercy; it was, however, commuted to transportation for life.

27. DREADFUL ACCIDENT AT THE LONDON DOCKS.—A party consisting of a gentleman and several ladies went to the docks for the purpose of going over that vast establishment. They were joined there by the brother of one of the ladies, a clerk in the docks, who was to escort them round. After viewing some of the warehouses, they crossed a bridge and entered No. 10 warehouse. The access to the several floors is by an hydraulic lift; by which the party, in some

degree from curiosity, desired to be carried up. One-half had been landed on the fourth story, and the others were about to ascend, when a frightful scream was heard, and two of the ladies were seen to fall. They were two of the first party who had been looking down the passage by which the lifts pass up and down on their ascending friends. Unfortunately at this moment one of the foremen was descending from a higher floor by another lift. The machinery fits the passage closely, and the consequence was, that the heads of the unfortunate ladies were caught in a kind of guillotine between the lift and rail. One of them, the sister of the clerk, was killed instantly; the back of her head and her face were crushed in. The other lady was dreadfully, but not fatally injured, and was conveyed to the London Hospital.

27. CHILD-MURDER IN SUFFOLK.—*Bury St. Edmunds.*—Emma Mussett, 31, was indicted for the wilful murder of her legitimate infant at Stoke-Nayland on the 29th of February.

The prisoner is a married woman, residing with her husband, a labourer, and it appeared that she was well known to be in the family way early this year; indeed, she had never denied the fact, but had stated that she expected to be confined in May. On the 29th of February she sent a neighbour for a nurse to clean up her room, alleging that she had experienced a miscarriage, and denying that she had given birth to a child. When a surgeon was called in she repeated this story; but he examined her, and, having satisfied himself that more had taken place than she admitted, insisted on sending for a policeman unless the prisoner

produced the child. After a little hesitation the prisoner went to a box in her bed-room, and took out a bag in which was the dead body of a full-grown male child, the head of which had been smashed almost flat, as if it had been beaten with some hard substance, while the jaws were broken and blood was flowing from its mouth and nose. The usual medical tests being resorted to, two experienced surgeons were satisfied that the child had been born alive, and had had an existence independent of its parent, and they came to the conclusion, that all the blows had been inflicted during life, and could not have resulted from accidental causes during, or immediately after, birth. The prisoner being spoken to, afterwards stated that the child was stillborn, and gave a long account of the agony she underwent during its birth, which she described as exceeding the "hardest day's work she had ever done." An examination of the coal-cellar attached to the house led to the discovery of a bloody brick and billet of wood under a shelf, on the top of which were two pools of human blood and a single human hair attached to a projecting nail. These appearances the prisoner explained by saying that she had recently killed a rabbit on the spot; but a microscopic examination of the blood and hair entirely disproved this statement, and the prisoner was given into custody on this charge.

The Lord Chief Justice left it to the jury to say whether the child had come by its death by accident, or wilfully on the part of the prisoner. One thing was clear, and that was, that she had concealed the birth of the child, though there did not appear to exist a motive

for that step any more than for its deliberate murder. That she could be altogether acquitted was not possible; but the more serious question was, whether she was guilty of concealment only, or whether she had not also committed the atrocious offence with which she was charged in this indictment.

The jury, after short deliberation, returned a verdict of "Wilful Murder," and she was sentenced to death.

28. ROBBERY BY AN ORDNANCE CLERK AT PORTSMOUTH.—A robbery, more remarkable for the singular device adopted by the robber for his escape than for any intrinsic novelty, has been perpetrated at the Government works at Portsmouth. The pay-clerk, whose name was Charlier, had been entrusted to draw a cheque for £1130. A messenger usually accompanied him to carry the money, which, being in gold and silver, was rather weighty. This man the clerk got rid of by sending him round on a message, appointing to meet him at the gun-wharf gate. Of course the delinquent did not keep the appointment. He had, in fact, absconded with the money, accompanied by a girl of bad repute. With some difficulty the parties were traced to a coffee-house in Fenchurch Street. Thither the Superintendent of the Portsmouth Police repaired, and said to the landlady, "A widow and young lady slept here last night?" She replied they had, but that the widow lady was unwell, apparently troubled in mind. The polite officer said he was sorry, and would call again to see them. He went into the street, and procured the aid of a London policeman. He then again went in, and said he wished to see the

ladies. The landlady said he could not see them unless he sent up his card and name. He then told the landlady who he was, and he went up-stairs with the London constable, where he found the prisoner and his female companion. The absconder was admirably got up as a middle-aged widow, in weeds, and having a cadaverous thin face passed well for one who might have lost "the prop that did sustain her house." His apparel was complete, consisting of widow's cap, bonnet and crape veil, false hair in bands, black alpaca dress, black cloth mantle, lady's boots, showing off a small neat foot to advantage, open-worked stockings, white corded skirt, pocket-handkerchief with widow's hem, and spectacles. The prisoner made but a faint attempt to deny his identity, and then surrendered his booty, short about £30, which he had expended in his outfit and travelling. He was convicted: his female companion, who seemed to have no knowledge of his theft, was discharged.

30. SIGNATURE OF THE TREATY OF PEACE. — At 10 o'clock at night the metropolis was aroused by the reverberation of a Royal salute from St. James's Park, being the public notification that the Government had received intelligence of the conclusion of the negotiations and the signature of the Treaty of Peace; and as the last boom died away the distant sound of the Tower guns came floating in the air. The sound brought forth many persons from their homes, and considerable crowds collected in the neighbourhood of Charing Cross, who stayed about to a late hour talking over the glad tidings. The bells of St. Martin's, St. Bride's, and other

churches, rung out merry peals in celebration of the good news. On the following morning, before 10 o'clock, a large concourse of people assembled in front of the Mansion House, in anticipation of hearing the peace announced from the lips of the civic authority. At that hour the Lord Mayor, attended by the Sheriffs, the Swordbearer, the Macebearer, and the City Marshal, advanced to the stone balcony (on which a covered *dais* of crimson cloth had been erected), and read the following despatch from the Secretary of State for the Home Department:—

"Home Office, Mar. 31, 1856.

"My Lord,—I have the honour to acquaint your Lordship that a despatch has been this morning received from the Earl of Clarendon, Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, dated Paris, the 30th, announcing that a definitive treaty for the restoration of peace, and for the maintenance of the integrity and independence of the Ottoman empire, was yesterday signed at Paris by the Plenipotentiaries of Her Majesty, of the Emperor of the French, of the King of Sardinia, and of the Sultan, and also of the Emperor of Austria and of the King of Prussia, on the one part, and of the Emperor of All the Russias on the other.

"I have the honour to be,

"My Lord,

"Your Lordship's most obedient,

"Humble servant,

"G. GREY.

"The Right Hon. the Lord

"Mayor, &c."

The announcement was received with loud cheers.

At 12 o'clock the Lord Mayor, attended by the civic functionaries, left the Mansion House,

and proceeded on foot to the Royal Exchange, whence, amid much enthusiasm and loyalty, his lordship read the despatch. The windows of all the houses in the immediate neighbourhood of the Royal Exchange were filled with spectators, chiefly ladies, who evinced lively interest in the proceedings. Standards and union-jacks floated all day from the public and Government buildings, and from the mastheads of the ships in the river.

As soon as the official proclamation had been made at the Royal Exchange and Guildhall, the guns were fired at the Tower.

At Dublin the guns were fired and the bells rung. The news was generally welcomed throughout the country by the ringing of the church bells.

The signature of the treaty was hailed at Paris with uncommon satisfaction. The moment the last signature was affixed to the important document, the guns of the Invalides fired a salute of 101 guns, and a general joy pervaded the whole city. Immediately after they had affixed their signatures, the Plenipotentiaries proceeded to the Palace of the Tuileries to communicate the important fact to the Emperor. His Majesty received them in some form in the Salon des Ambassadeurs, and warmly thanked them for their exertions for the restoration of peace. In the evening Paris, by the spontaneous act of its inhabitants, was splendidly illuminated.

THE IRISH CENSUS. — SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT. — The volume of the "ANNUAL REGISTER" for the year 1851 contains a summary of the census of Ireland. An interesting document has been issued

in the shape of a report on ages and education supplementary to the census. The most remarkable feature of the report—and it is one well worth pointing out—is the diminution of the number of persons under five years of age relatively to the whole compared with the proportion they bore to the whole in the census of 1841. In 1841 the proportion of children under the age of five years was 12,603 in every 100,000; in 1851 that proportion was reduced to 9840. Of persons above five and under ten there is also some but not a great diminution; viz. in the ratio of 13,175 to 12,310. In the two next quinquennial periods—from 10 to 15 years and from 15 to 20—there is an increase; but from 20 to 40 there is a decrease, as there also is in the period from 90 to 100. As to the diminution in the proportion of children, it may very certainly be attributed to the effect of the famine years; because unquestionably children of tender age would be less able to survive the deprivation and miseries of that dreadful time, and because the want of the means of subsistence no doubt prevented many marriages and drove large numbers of the adult population to emigration. It is not so easy to account for the increased proportion of persons between the ages of 10 and 20. The great number of persons existing in Ireland who attain an age far beyond the ordinary limit of mortality has been frequently remarked. It is very extraordinary that notwithstanding the famine, which destroyed the young, the very aged should have survived. In 1851 there were in Ireland 711 persons above 100 years of age; while in England, with thrice the popula-

tion, the number was 319. The oldest person was a man, aged 121.

With regard to education the report presents some very satisfactory features. Notwithstanding the pressure for food and employment consequent upon the famine year, the number of males unable to read or write had decreased four per cent., and of females eight per cent., in proportion to the population.

DEMOLITION OF THE LAST GIBBET.—The last gibbet erected in England has been demolished by the workmen employed by the contractors making the extensive docks for the North-Eastern Railway Company upon Jarrow Stake, on the Tyne. The person who was gibbeted at that place was William Jobbing, a pitman, aged 30 years, convicted at the Durham Midsummer Assizes of 1832, of being concerned with another pitman (who absconded and was never apprehended), with murdering Mr. Nicholas Fairles, a magistrate, upon the road to Jarrow, on the 1st of June, in that year, and was hung that month at Durham. In the summer of 1832 there was a lengthened strike of the pitmen of Northumberland and Durham. Bitter feelings arose between masters and men. Many hundreds of the families of the men were turned out of their cottages and lived in the lanes and roads in camps for months. The collieries had to be protected by military and an immense number of special constables, notwithstanding which three murders and many outrages were committed upon non-union men, and Mr. Fairles fell a victim to his zeal in endeavouring to maintain the law. At the time of Jobbing's trial an old law had

been revived which condemned a murderer to the gibbet. Jobbing was the only person, it is believed, gibbeted under that Act; but so great was the horror and disgust excited by the sight of the instrument, and by the remembrance of the body of the poor wretch swinging in chains by the side of a great public road, that much satisfaction was felt when the "navvies" took it down one dark night, and either sunk it in Shields Bar or buried it under the walls of Jarrow Monastery.

MURDERS IN IRELAND.—Many of the homicidal crimes perpetrated in Ireland arise from motives which must be found in every society, and which, therefore, are not to be imputed as a peculiar reproach upon the national character. Many of these foul deeds would not deserve any special record were it not needful that they should be noticed simultaneously with those more horrible assassinations perpetrated under the influence of a secret tribunal, which has for generations been the curse of that unhappy land. Although the national prosperity of Ireland for some years past has been such as completely to alter the aspect of the country, it will probably take many years of content and good government—perhaps the passing away of more than one generation—to purge the land of the monstrous organization which keeps all men in dread. Some horrible cases of assassination under the secret agrarian code were recorded in the volume of last year. The present year presents a repetition of the crime.

On the 15th of February, as Mr. Lemon Armstrong, a gentleman of high position, residing in the county of Leitrim, was return-

ing from Sligo on a jaunting car, accompanied by his wife, he was fired at when passing a grove of trees between Friarstown and Dro-mohair, the ball of the assassin striking him in the hip and lodging in the thigh. The wound was not dangerous, and Mr. Armstrong was strong enough to drive to the nearest police-station, and despatched the force on the traces of the murderers. Two men were captured, one of whom Mr. Armstrong identified as being the person who fired the shot. This man, it appears, was an old hand in the trade, and had been formerly tried at Leitrim Assizes on a charge of murder.

On the 1st of March a small landlord was murdered under circumstances peculiarly characteristic of the crime, which keeps the poor proprietor under a still more terrible bondage than the great landlord. The victim's name was Callaghan. According to the evidence given before a coroner's jury, deceased came to the country from Dublin on Friday, February 29, and after transacting some rural business (which indicated a restless and litigious disposition) went home and called up his steward and housekeeper; the latter he told to leave his house instant, adding that it was her family sued him and impounded his cattle, and that he would turn her and them off the land. The housekeeper caught her clothes up and went out. Deceased went out also, and told his steward to boil the kettle in his absence, and that he would go for some milk for tea; deceased and the woman left the house together, he scolding her until they came to the house of one Michael Quigley, a tenant to Mr. Callaghan. This house was about 200 yards from deceased's. Here Mr. Cal-

laghan stopped to get milk for his tea. In the meanwhile the woman was crouching behind a hedge. When Mr. Callaghan turned round on his way home this woman rose from the hedge and went into the house. Mr. Callaghan had not gone more than 15 or 20 yards from Quigley's house on his way back, when he was struck in the forehead, apparently knocked flat back, his forehead beaten completely in, the frontal bone separated from the skull, the eyes driven out, and the whole skull shattered to pieces. The woman of the house had opened the door to the discharged housekeeper, and the two women entered into an animated account of their grievances. By their own account it must have been while they were thus conversing that the assassins were murdering Mr. Callaghan within 15 or 20 yards of where they stood—yet both women swear they heard no noise or sound whatever. The steward, thinking his master a long time away, took a lantern and went in search of him. The night was dark, and he discovered him on the pathway by observing his dog lapping up what, on looking at, he found to be his master's blood. "Mr. Callaghan had turned out many tenants; it appears he even turned out the parish priest. He was considered a very tyrannical landlord, and was greatly disliked."

At the Down Assizes, a woman named Agnes Burn was convicted of the deliberate and mercenary murder of an old woman, at Saintfield.

Margaret Withers was a poor old woman who kept a small huxter's shop in the town of Saintfield. Within three doors of her house lived two sisters, Agnes Burns and Mary West, who were

in the habit of making purchases at the shop of their neighbour, a relation of their own. On the evening of the 22nd of last month the two sisters, having heard that a small sum of money had come into the old woman's possession, took counsel together how they should kill her and obtain the object of their diabolical avarice. They determined on a plan, and they deliberately proceeded to the old woman's shop, and there, while she was serving them with some articles of her little stock, they fell on her and murdered her. When the deed was done fear seems to have fallen upon them, and they were unable to prosecute the search for the wages of their sin. All that they could find was a few pounds of butter, and this they carried off as the sole fruits of their bloody deed. The murderesses attempted to dispose of their paltry booty with so little precaution, and at so low a price, that suspicion was aroused, and the perpetrators arrested. To make the whole affair more horrible, one of the sisters turned approver, and by her evidence hanged the other.

On the 11th of March, a young farmer's son, residing at Pallas Green, Wicklow, was waylaid while returning from a farm, and his skull beaten to pieces. The savage act had no ostensible provocation, and is supposed to have been committed in the frenzy of drink.

On the 17th of March, a man named Gallagher was murdered at Ballyconnell, Cavan, on the spot where a man of the same name was shot in 1845. The present victim interfered to protect a boy whom some men were ill-using. These ruffians instantly set upon him and battered his skull in.

As the 17th is St. Patrick's day, this crime also is probably to be ascribed to drink.

APRIL.

I. MURDER AT LIVERPOOL.—At the Liverpool Assizes, James Carr and Philip Wall were indicted for the wilful murder of James House, at Liverpool, on the 20th of February last.

Mr. Aspinall, counsel for the Crown, said that the case charged against the prisoners was one which would demand their utmost consideration, both from the circumstantial character of the evidence, and the various statements which had been made by the prisoners. The deceased James House was a sailor, and was about to sail on a voyage on the 20th February, and on the previous night he had left his lodgings about 11 o'clock, and proceeded to a public-house. He was seen to leave this place about 12 o'clock, very much intoxicated, with a girl. He was watched by a policeman and advised to go home. Afterwards he was seen lying drunk on the pavement, and the policeman saw the prisoners lift him up and take him into a brothel. They told the policeman he was a shipmate of theirs. According to the woman who kept the brothel he left her house at half-past 2 in the morning. Nothing more was seen of him until a carter, upon going to a stable adjoining Buggin Entry, in which was the brothel, about 4 o'clock in the morning, came upon the dead body of the man, lying flat on his back in the entry, without either coat, waistcoat, or boots; a muffler was tied very tight and knotted round the throat of the deceased under the ear; his face and hands were quite livid, apparently from strangula-

tion, and, on taking the body to the Northern Hospital, the surgeon gave it as his opinion that the deceased had been strangled. About 5 on the same morning the two prisoners came to another brothel in the neighbourhood, each of them wearing part of deceased's clothes. A third man came with them, but he left immediately afterwards. The prisoners remained at this house with two girls for some time. One of the girls noticed that Carr, whom she knew, wore a muffler different to the one he usually wore, and she mentioned it, because she knew that a girl to whom she had given a muffler had told her that she had given it to Carr; and upon questioning him as to what he had done with it, he said it was on a man's neck, and he thought he must be dead by that time. In the course of an hour or two one of the girls went out, at the request of Carr, for some ale, and upon returning she told the prisoners that a man had been found murdered in Buggin Entry; upon which Carr said, "I would take any man's life if he had plenty of money." Wall then took off a coat and Carr a vest (which were proved to be part of the deceased's clothes) and requested one of the girls to pawn them; but, on the pawnbroker refusing to take them from the girl, Wall went and pawned them himself. Ultimately the prisoners were taken into custody, and upon Carr were found a pair of braces and comb, which were proved also to be the property of the deceased, and Wall was wearing a pair of shoes which were the same that the deceased left his lodgings in. The muffler worn by Carr was that of the deceased man, while the one found around the dead man's neck was

the one which a girl named "Red Mary" had given to Carr.

In the course of the trial one of the jurymen fell down in a fit, and as it was found that he could not proceed with his duties, the Judge discharged the jury; and a fresh jurymen having been sworn, and the jury having been again charged, the judge read over the evidence of each witness, the witnesses being re-sworn and attending as far as the case had proceeded.

The counsel for the defence addressed the jury on behalf of their respective clients, relying on the evidence being purely circumstantial, and much of it depending on a class of witnesses whose habits of life entitled them to little credit. The circumstances also proved, they contended, were consistent with the deceased having died from a fit of apoplexy, caused by intemperance and exposure to the cold; and, although they did not attempt to deny that the prisoners had robbed him while in his helpless state of drunkenness, yet they denied that any murder had been committed.

The jury returned a verdict of "Guilty" against both the prisoners, accompanying it with a recommendation to mercy.

Sentence of death was passed upon the convicts with the usual solemnities, the learned Judge holding out little hope that the recommendation of the jury would be of any avail. The sentence upon both men was afterwards commuted to transportation for life.

4. THE KEYNSHAM BURGLARY.—*Taunton*.—George Rogers, Henry Dufferty, Charles Hawkins, Thomas Dallimore, William Oldfield, Joseph Taylor, Mark Fawkes, William Belston, and William Ryan, were indicted for having, on the

6th of December, burglariously broken and entered the house of Mary Baber, and stolen a spoon, a ring, a silver pencil-case, three spoons, a watchguard, and 8*l.* in money, and beating and striking James Veale, otherwise Flower, on the head.

The case, which excited immense interest, will be best told by the narrative of the sufferers.

Mary Baber.—I am a widow, residing at Keynsham. The house stands by itself. On the 6th of December the occupants of the house were myself, my sister, my aunt, my uncle, and a man and maid servant. I was up last that night. All the doors and windows were fastened. There were five rooms on the first floor—a storeroom, a room in which Mrs. Hopkins slept, a room in which Mr. Jones and the man slept, my room in the front, and a room in which the servant-maid (Cambridge) slept. The storeroom window had not any shutter. Between 2 and 3 o'clock on the morning of the 6th of December I was disturbed by a noise, and footsteps, and cries. I jumped out of bed and fastened my door, and went to the window to make an alarm, when two men burst into the room. Their faces were covered with something black. I had a light in my room. One of the men was a tall, stout man; the other rather shorter, and stout. They had on their heads "bowler" hats, fastened under the chin. They demanded my money. I said I would give them all I had, and I gave them my pocket with my money and my keys, and told them to search and take what they liked. Those men were Rogers and Dufferty. I afterwards saw them at the Bedminster station. I knew them directly. They said

there were 20 round the house, and it would be of no use to offer any resistance. Dufferty had a life-preserver with a knob at the end. He flourished it about, and said he would have my money or my life, and that I had more money hid about the house. I told him he must take my life then, for I could not give him what I had not. There were some silver articles on my dressing-table, which they took. It was my custom to go and receive my rents about November or December. They said they knew I had received a sum of money. I told them I had, but I had put it in the bank. They asked for my bank-book. After that Dufferty left the room, and Rogers remained sitting in a chair opposite to me for a quarter of an hour. The light was burning all the time. Dufferty returned, brandished the life-preserver over me, and said he would have my money or my life. After a time Rogers said, "We are going down to have something to eat and drink, and if you make a noise we will come up again." I saw no more of them. I was afraid to move, but hearing groans in my uncle's room I went to that room, and saw James Veale bleeding on the bed. I believe that at that time they had left the house. The clock struck 3 while they were in the house. They had asked for my watch. I told them I did not wear one. They said I did, and asked where the old-fashioned watch was, and I told them I had changed it away. I had till recently been in the habit of wearing a watch. After the men had left I sent Veale down to fasten the door. The things in my sister's room were all strewn about. The constable

came about 5 o'clock. I had sent for him. Some silver spoons and gold articles were taken from my sister's room. 8*l.* in money was taken from my uncle's room. The door of the parlour had been burst open, and some bottles with wine and gin had been taken out of the cupboard, which had been locked. It had been forced open by some instrument. The woodwork had been broken.

Cross-examined.—The light in my room was Child's night light; it was placed by my bedside. The curtains of the bed were not drawn. I was frightened, but I did not lose my presence of mind. I saw the men perfectly. I had not the slightest opportunity of discovering their features. The tall man was dressed in a dark smockfrock, and that man was Rogers. Seven men were placed before me at the Bedminster station. I picked out Rogers from a knowledge of his shape. I first thought Ryan was like the man; but I had a doubt, and said his shoulders did not appear to be broad enough. I also knew him by his voice!

Mrs. Baber's servant was examined.—The robbers had not broken into her room and she did not see them; but she was able to swear distinctly to the footsteps of one—it was a hobbling, crippled way of walking.

Mrs. Hopkins, whose room was burst open and herself ill-used, was too ill to attend, but her deposition was put in and read.

James Veale.—I am in the service of George Chapple, who rents Mrs. Baber's farm. I slept in her house to guard it. On the 6th of December I slept in the same room with Mr. Jones, who is more than 80 years of age. In the morning I saw two men come into the

room with a lantern. They struck me with a cudgel while I was in bed. I was nearly stunned. The wound bled very much. They wrapped me up in the bed-clothes, and put the clothes in my mouth, so that my breath was almost gone. The men had something over their faces. Two men were on me, and I heard some one at Mr. Jones's box. After the men were gone I went for the constable. I have known Belston for 30 years, but I never knew any bad deeds of him. Fawkes lives at Keynsham. I saw a ladder the next morning against the storeroom window. It had been brought from the barton.

J. H. Cattle.—I am a constable at Keynsham. I was sent for about 4 o'clock in the morning. I examined the house. I found a ladder had been placed against the storeroom window. The window had been broken so that a hand could be put in and the bolt removed. I went into Veale's room and saw a pillow-case covered with blood. On the 18th of December I went to the house of Hawkins, about 4 o'clock in the morning. I found a turnscREW, a painter's knife, a whip heavily loaded with iron or lead, and two centre bits, which fit into an iron frame called a "jemmy," a rough chisel, a bull's-eye lantern, two life-preservers, a pair of india-rubber goloshes, pair of pincers, and three Jem Crow hats. Hawkins was present, but did not say anything. On the 20th of December I went to Mrs. Baber's house with Police-constable Britton, and I pointed out the storeroom window. We compared the turnscREW with marks on the window. They corresponded. We also went to the cupboard, and found the marks on the door corresponded with the chisel. I took

Belston into custody on the 9th of December. I afterwards took him, with two others of the prisoners, from Shepton Mallet to Bedminster. On the road Ryan urged Belston to speak out like a man, and tell the truth, and said, "You can clear the lot of us; you know who it was committed the robbery, and you ought to speak out when you know we are innocent, and you know I am suffering wrongfully. You told me who were going to do it before the robbery, and you have told me so since. Why don't you speak out like a man, and tell the truth, and not see us here hand-bolted?" Belston said, "I will tell all I know when before the magistrates; will that do for you?" Some time after Ryan said to Belston, "You know I am suffering for another man—in the place of George Rogers?" Belston replied, "I believe you are." Bowker said, "Who is George Rogers?" Belston replied, "Why, you know him well; it's George Rogers, the fighting-man of Bedminster." Ryan kept a horse and cart at that time at Mrs. Clarke's, about 400 yards from Mrs. Baber's.

Police-constable Button confirmed this statement, and added, "Hawkins walks very strangely on his legs—much knock-kneed. I should know his walk half-a-mile off."

George Chapple.—I rent the farm of Mrs. Baber. I have employed Fawkes on different occasions at the farm. I saw Belston on the Saturday after the robbery; he came to my shop for some beefsteaks. Two or three men had been taken up on suspicion. He said to me, "You may depend upon it none of the Keynsham people know anything of the rob-

bery; it was the Bedminster gang, who robbed Mrs. Edgell and Miss Dyer." I told him I thought differently. He said, "You may depend upon it they don't, and I will give you my reasons; I was down at Collins's beerhouse, and we had a sort of house-warming and stayed till 1 o'clock in the morning; when I came out I saw six of the Bedminster gang coming up the hill—they generally go about in gangs—and they were coming up two first, three next, and one behind. I followed them up as far as Dr. Lodge's. I said to them 'Good night,' and they returned it." He said he had seen the same men several times. I told Bowker of this, and Belston was apprehended.

Edward Mortimer.—I live at Keynsham. On the night of the 6th of December I was going from Keynsham to Bristol about 12 o'clock. I met an old cart and horse, and three or four men riding. A little distance further I met two men walking. They had Jem Crow hats on. They were going towards Keynsham. I have since seen a horse and cart, and I am pretty positive the horse is the same.

James Summers.—I am a detective. I took up Hawkins. He asked what it was about. I said, "About the job at Keynsham." He said he knew nothing about it. I said, "Belston says you do." He said, "I always said the —— had no steel in him."

Emma Bryant.—I lived with Ryan at Keynsham on the 6th of December. I know William Belston. On the night of this robbery William Belston and Mark Fawkes came to our house about 11 o'clock. Belston knocked at the door, and asked if Ryan was

in. I said he was, but he had been lying down. Both of them came in, and I went and called Ryan, and he came down-stairs. They said they wanted something to drink, and Belston said he had but one sixpence in his pocket, and he gave it to me, and I fetched him a quart of beer. They sat down and remained about an hour, and drank the beer. Belston said, "I expect some men to come here presently." Ryan said, "I suppose you do; you promised to meet them here." After a time some one knocked at the door. I opened it, and saw a number of men on the roadside. That was about the middle of the night. Rogers I knew perfectly well; he was one, and Dufferty, Taylor, Dallimore, Hawkins, and Oldfield. After they knocked, Ryan, Belston, and Fawkes went out to them, and they all went on the road together towards Mrs. Baber's house. I shut the door and went on with my sewing. In an hour Ryan came back, and asked if I had any supper for him. I put it out and he had it, and went to bed. I came down-stairs between 3 and 4 o'clock to turn the cat out. As I was returning up-stairs I heard a great noise in the road. I called Ryan, as they were throwing at the window. He got up and told them he would meet them between 3 and 4 o'clock the next day. I looked out and saw Oldfield, Taylor, Hawkins, and Dallimore. There were seven or eight of them. I had known all the men before. The men then went away towards Bristol. I had no difficulty in seeing their faces.

This witness was severely cross-examined, and proved herself, as might be expected, to be a very bad

character. She clearly desired to screen Ryan.

William Oakley (Governor of Taunton Gaol). — In January, when Ryan was in my custody, he requested me to take down a statement, which I produce. The substance of it was, that he was accidentally near the house robbed at 3 o'clock in the morning, and a man rushed out and said, "Look sharp, here's a bloke or two leaving;" that he (Ryan) then saw several men, among whom he noticed Emery, Rich, and another man, and heard them say, "Stick together, it's late," &c.

The counsel for the prisoners addressed the jury on the evidence for the Crown, but called no witnesses except for Rogers and Oldfield, in respect of whom it was attempted to prove an *alibi*.

The jury found Belston, "Not Guilty;" Rogers, "Guilty;" Taylor, "Not Guilty;" Oldfield, "Not Guilty;" Hawkins, "Guilty;" Dufferty, "Guilty;" Dallimore, "Not Guilty;" Fawkes, "Not Guilty;" Ryan, "Not Guilty."

Judgment of death was recorded against Rogers, Dufferty, and Hawkins.

Ryan and Dallimore, who had been convicted of burglary the previous day, were sentenced, Ryan to 14 years' transportation, and Dallimore to four years' penal servitude.

Fawkes pleaded "Guilty" to an indictment charging him with receiving stolen property, and was sentenced to four years' penal servitude.

5. BOILER EXPLOSION AT PORTSMOUTH DOCKYARD; SEVERAL LIVES LOST.—A serious accident occurred in the Royal Dockyard at Portsmouth by the explosion of a boiler.

The scene of the catastrophe was a boiler-shed adjoining the smithy in which Nasmyth's steam-hammers are at work, and which are set in motion by the boilers therein. The men leave off work at 5 P.M., and most of them were cleansing themselves after their labours. Suddenly one of the boilers exploded with terrific violence. The walls of the shed were blown away, the walls of a workshop adjoining, in which the coppersmiths were at work, were blown in, and the windows and doors of the smithy were shattered. In the coppersmiths' shop three men were killed instantly, and their bodies shockingly mutilated; many others were hurt or scalded, of whom two died subsequently in Haslar Hospital. In the smithy many men were hurt by fragments or scalded by hot water and steam, but none fatally. It is singular that the stoker, who was tending the furnace of the boiler, and who was knocked down by the steam, escaped without material injury. This disaster was occasioned by the water in the boiler having been allowed to get too low.

6. FATAL ACCIDENT TO MR. FEATHERSTONHAUGH.—Mr. Featherstonhaugh, of the College, near Kirkoswald, a gentleman of ancient family, large property, and universally respected, has lost his life, by an accident in his own grounds and in the sight of his family. The deceased, while pursuing the usual country occupation of English gentlemen, in improving the value and beauty of his family mansion, had decided upon removing an ancient sycamore which stood in his front court, and which had become decayed and hindered the growth of some trees. He himself took a share in the demo-

lition of the relic of past ages, and had warned his men to stand out of the way of the falling branches. The tree had been cut, and the deceased was hauling on the rope which was to determine the fall of the tree. It came down in immense ruin. The men got out of the way, but on looking back found that their master had been struck down, and was covered by the limbs. Of the terrible effects of an injury arising from so simple a cause, the surgeon gave a description. He said: I was called to deceased and saw him before 10 o'clock. I found him in bed and scarcely sensible, but he recovered his senses very shortly after, and retained them for two hours. He had a compound fracture of the left leg and a bruise on the right side of the left eye. There were some fractures on the shoulder-blade, ribs, and back. He wished to be raised, and in putting my arms below him to raise him, I distinctly felt the crepitation of broken bones. His pulse was never perceptible the whole time. He complained most of pain in his right shoulder-blade and chest. He did not complain of his back or leg. He could not move his legs or right arm. He died in four hours. No doubt there had been some internal injuries to the chest sufficient to cause death. The shock to the nervous system was quite sufficient and very probably was the cause of death.

8. DEATH OF FIVE CHILDREN FROM STARVATION.—A very melancholy case of starvation has occurred at Cardiff. It appeared from the evidence adduced before a coroner's jury, that John Welsh, an Irish labourer, arrived in this country with his wife and seven children shortly before last Christ-

mas; and that about five weeks since he deserted his unfortunate family, leaving them wholly destitute, in a miserable lodging-house in Cardiff. The family consisted of the deserted wife, a girl sixteen years of age, a boy of thirteen, a boy of nine, a girl of seven, twins (boy and girl) of four years, and a girl of two years; and their only means of subsistence were 5s. per week earned by the eldest girl, and an occasional 1s., or at the most 2s. per week, earned by the mother by picking potatoes landed from the vessels. Such a sum was, of course, too little to provide food for a family of eight persons at the present rate of provisions. Unhappily a very strong feeling of reluctance prevented her from applying for relief until about a week before the catastrophe, when she instantly received an order for food, some necessaries, and for medical attendance. When the parish surgeon arrived, he found that the eldest boy was already dead, and from the symptoms described had evidently been labouring under an attack of whooping-cough. The emaciated state of the other four children induced inquiry, and he found that they were not suffering from any disease, but from actual want of food. The relieving officer, under his direction, furnished the sufferers with wine and other necessaries; but the aid had come too late, and, one by one, the four younger children dropped off. One of the twins, a girl, aged four years, died on Thursday; Bessy, aged seven years, died on Friday; the twin boy died on Sunday, and Ellen, aged two years, on Monday. On examination of the corpses, it was evident that the poor creatures had died of mere want of sustenance. It appeared

that the unfortunate mother had done all in her power to sustain her children, and had herself suffered the extremity of hunger; but she could not be persuaded to apply for relief.

8. MURDER OF MRS. SARAH KELLY.—A horrible assassination took place near Moate, in the county of Westmeath, the perpetrators of which have hitherto altogether eluded the search of justice. The victim was Mrs. Sarah Kelly, the owner of the estate on which the atrocity took place, and whose name had been recently made well known as the plaintiff in the celebrated cause of *Kelly v. Thewles*, and the romantic details of her life which came out in the course of it. The unfortunate lady went out in the afternoon with, and at the request of, her nephew, a young man named Strevens. She was likewise accompanied by her solicitor, Mr. Campion, who, however, shortly returned, by Mrs. Kelly's direction, to see after some accounts. Arrived at a field on the estate, her nephew left her and went to another part, where two men and a number of girls were at work picking stones. She engaged in conversation with a little girl, in whom she had lately taken an interest, and for whom she was trying to get a situation in Dublin. While she was thus occupied, two men entered the field dressed in women's clothes and closely masked, so that only their eyes could be seen. They walked towards her, and she showed great alarm, and caught hold of the little girl she was talking to, who told her not to be frightened, as the men were only having a game with the girls. Mrs. Kelly, however, ran towards a ditch at the side of the field and fell. The men followed, and first

one and then the other of them fired what seemed to be a pistol at the unhappy woman as she lay on the ground. Mr. Strevens then began to shout, and the assassins moved towards him. However, he ran away, and they retreated by the gate at which they had entered. The nephew rushed home and conveyed the news to Mr. Campion, the solicitor, in the most frantic manner. The shots had taken frightful effect, and the poor woman's brains lay scattered on the path. Some days after the ground was dug up, and two bullets were found beneath the spot.

There seems no reason to believe that this outrage was at all of an agrarian character. Mrs. Kelly was a kind landlady, and no discontent was known to exist amongst her tenantry.

An inquest was held, which occupied two days, but threw no light on the mysterious catastrophe. On the first day, the little girl to whom Mrs. Kelly was talking was examined, and gave her evidence with much clearness. On the second day another girl was examined, whose account differed slightly from the former in one or two not very material particulars, but who gave her evidence with excessive recklessness and stupidity. The jury found that the deceased came by her death by gun-shot wounds inflicted by two persons unknown, and that the said two persons were guilty of wilfully murdering her.

Several persons were arrested, amongst whom were Mr. Campion, the solicitor, and Mr. Strevens, the nephew. All but the last were very speedily released. He was detained for about a month, and then obtained his discharge by application to be admitted to bail.

The evidence against him consisted in two informations of a rather curious character by Mr. Campion and a man named Flood. They evinced a very strong belief on their part of Mr. Strevens' guilt, but offered very little substantial proof. The strongest circumstances against him were that Mrs. Kelly had been greatly dissatisfied with his management of her lands at Ballinderry (the estate on which the murder took place), and had discovered considerable arrears in his account of moneys received by him as her agent there; that he had asked very particularly whether his aunt was going back to Dublin; that he had changed one man for another who was in his confidence to superintend the workpeople in the field; his escaping from the scene of the murder instead of looking after the murderers; that he was seen to go to a drawer in which the police afterwards found a bullet. This evidence was so inconclusive, the Court liberated him on bail, and no proceeding has since been taken. The whole affair remains wrapt in the mystery which from the first involved it.

9. THE MURDER OF MISS HINDS. — In the CHRONICLE of last year, p. 153, is an account of the shocking murder of Miss Hinds, in the county of Cavan; and it is added that the police had strong reasons for supposing that the unfortunate lady had been condemned and executed by the judgment of that fearful agrarian combination which has wrought such evil deeds in Ireland; and that, in fact, the immediate instigators of the deed were her own tenants. Two of the miscreants have felt the vengeance of the law. A special commission was opened at Cavan on the 9th April, before which James Murphy

was arraigned on the charge of being one of the actual perpetrators of the deed of blood. The evidence obtained by the police connected the murder with this terrible secret tribunal, which is prepared to exact a bloody retribution for offences against its secret code, and to execute for money the plans of revenge which the hatred or malice of its members are prepared to pay for. The action of a secret and unlawful tribunal admits but of two alternatives in its dealings with its victims—impunity or death. The conduct of the unfortunate Miss Hinds in the management of the property she had bought in the Encumbered Estates Court, was not such as met the approbation of her tenants, and it was generally resolved that she should be murdered. Several meetings were held at the house of Dunne, one of the principal tenants, and a guardian of the union, at which the plans of assassination were well considered and determined; funds were raised by general contribution, sums being levied by terror from those who were not present. Assassins were readily supplied by the Riband Club: one, Red Banon, was one of those hardened ruffians whose whole life is a crime, and who are ready to steep their hands in blood for a piece of money; the other, James Murphy, was a young man about 30 years of age, a labourer on the estate, an industrious man, and of good character until he had recently been induced to join a Riband lodge. The confirmed ruffian made his escape, the less experienced murderer was captured, and was now put on his trial for his crime. The police had obtained accurate information of the whole progress of the conspiracy—much more than they

were able to prove. The details rested on the evidence of an approver, a scoundrel scarce one shade better than the murderers. This man, Terence Banon, swore that two days previous to the murder, Thomas Dunne, the principal conspirator, brought the prisoner Murphy home to his house, and he was there on the following day, Thursday; on that day he (Banon) got two pistols from a man named Logan, and by Dunne's directions bought powder and caps. He loaded the pistols with slugs, and on the same night another pistol was obtained from a man named Felix Prior. On the day of the occurrence Terence Banon waited in a small boat, or cot, on a small stream near the spot. He ferried Murphy, and a person not in custody, known as Pat Banon, across it. The latter said to him, "Well, Terry, that job's done," and the two latter said that they had shot Miss Hinds. The witness (Terence Banon) afterwards gave 4*l.* to Murphy and 8*l.* to Red Pat Banon. Before they parted the prisoner and Red Banon changed dresses.

The statement of the approver, who ought certainly to have been hanged himself, was so far confirmed by the evidence brought forward by the police, that the jury, after a trial of two days, found the prisoner "Guilty."

On the following day, the chief conspirator, Thomas Dunne, was put to the bar. He was 37 years of age, was respectably dressed, and was a person of considerable property.

The approver gave minute details of the conspiracy, how the plans had been laid, the blood-money collected, the ruffians hired, and the hire paid. His evidence

was sufficiently corroborated, and the jury, at the close of the second day, after an hour's deliberation, found the prisoner "Guilty."

Both the prisoners were then placed at the bar, and sentence of death was passed upon them. They heard it unmoved. Dunne's chief anxiety seemed to be, "that his body should be given to his people." They were executed on the 16th May. Both denied their guilt to the last. The drop at Cavan admits of the execution of but one criminal at a time, and the doom of the law was first executed upon Murphy. Immediately that his body had been removed, Dunne was brought out. Even the knowledge that his confederate had but a few minutes before been sent to the judgment-seat of an unerring and just Judge, failed to shake his firmness, and he died unshrinking and unrepentant.

9. THE UXBRIDGE MURDERS.—At the Central Criminal Court, Elizabeth Anne Harris, 25, a young woman, with an infant, apparently about three months old, in her arms, was indicted for the wilful murder of her female child, Ellen. During the trial the prisoner was seated, and it was evident that she was unable to stand.

Mr. Bodkin, counsel for the Crown, said that the charge against the prisoner was that of having committed the crime of wilful murder upon the body of her own child, five years old, and it would be useless to endeavour to conceal from them the fact that at the same time this offence was alleged to have been committed, and in all probability by the same act, the prisoner deprived another child of life by throwing them both into the canal, near Uxbridge. The prisoner was an unmarried woman.

It appeared that she had three illegitimate children, two of whom were those whose deaths were the subject of inquiry, and the third the baby that was now in her arms. It seemed that at the time of the fatal occurrence she had taken her children out of the union workhouse, where she and they had been living for some time, with the avowed intention of going to join the father of her last child, who was living at Portsmouth; and it was to be feared that, finding the two older children were likely to be an encumbrance to her, and knowing that the man with whom she was about to join was not in a condition to support them, she had recourse to the dreadful expedient of taking their lives, and thus relieving herself of the burden they entailed upon her.

Ellen Walker.—The prisoner is my sister. She had three children at the beginning of this year. She was unmarried. Two of the children were named Ellen and Agnes, and Fanny was the name of her last baby. I remember seeing the prisoner with the two older children on Friday, the 15th of February, at 11 o'clock in the morning. She had been twice in the workhouse, and had left it on that morning. I met her in Cowley Road, near Uxbridge. I spoke to her, and walked on; and she told me she was going to Portsmouth, and that she was going to take the three children with her. She had not enough money, she said, to pay her fare, and she sent to me in the afternoon to borrow 2s. I understood she was going to the father of the last child. I sent her the money she asked for and some refreshment to help her on her journey. I saw the dead bodies of the two children, Ellen and

Agnes, on the following morning, at the Anglers' public-house.

Elizabeth Walker, the daughter of the last witness, said,—I remember the day on which the two children were drowned. I had been to the workhouse that morning, and saw the prisoner and her three children, and we all came away from the workhouse together and went to Mr. Tollett's public-house at West Drayton, and left the prisoner there. I went there again about 6 o'clock in the evening, and found the prisoner there with her three children. I gave her 2s. and some bread and butter. In a short time the prisoner went out with Ellen and Agnes, and I nursed the baby while she was gone. She told me she was going to look for a bed for the children; but I did not know where she was going. The prisoner was absent about 20 minutes, and she came back without the children. She took her luggage to the railway station, and then returned and took the baby and put me into the omnibus to go back to Uxbridge.

Joseph Goodall. — I am a labourer, and live at Yarnsley, near Uxbridge. There is a bridge over the Grand Junction Canal at Yarnsley. On the evening the bodies of the children were found in the canal I was close to the bridge, and I saw the prisoner with two children near the towing-path. She went from the towing-path into the Uxbridge Road. I saw her again about three minutes after this, apparently coming back again, and the children were still with her. She made some inquiry of me about a Mr. Turton, a shoemaker, and I told her where he lived, and she went away in that direction. I saw her a third time, on the Colham Bridge, which is

another bridge over the canal, about half-past 7 o'clock. She had no children with her then, and she appeared to be going towards the railway station. I saw the prisoner again about 8 o'clock the same evening, near Yarnsley Bridge, and she then had the baby in her arms. I saw nothing more of the prisoner after this, and later in the evening I saw the dead bodies of the children lying on the banks of the canal close to Yarnsley Bridge, at the spot where I had first seen the prisoner.

This witness's sister also deposed to seeing the prisoner in the first instance with three children, and shortly after with the baby. The finding of the bodies near the spot where they were last seen with the prisoner and dressed in the same manner was proved; and Cozens, the keeper of the beer-shop on the opposite side of the bridge to that kept by Tollett, stated that the prisoner came to him and inquired if she could be accommodated with her baby; and on being told that she could, she went away and returned with a baby, and was soon after taken into custody. She never referred to any other children.

Police-constable Taylor deposed, that on being informed of the circumstances, he went to Cozens' public-house and took the prisoner into custody. On our way to the police-station we had to pass the Anglers' public-house, and I and the prisoner went into the room there where the dead bodies were, and I told her they were the children that had been found drowned, and the prisoner went towards them and kissed them both, and said, "They are my children; I brought them out of the union this morning." She made no other observation.

Mary Smith said, — I act as searcher at the Hillingdon police-station, and I searched the prisoner the same night she was brought there in custody. I said to her, "Oh dear, oh dear! are you aware what you have been doing?" She replied, "I am perfectly aware what I have been doing." On the same evening the wife of one of the inspectors came into the room where I and the prisoner were, and she said she wondered the prisoner had not served the baby the same, and the prisoner then said, "This one has a father; the others had not."

Stephen Masters, a police-constable, said, — On the night the prisoner was brought to the police-station I was in the same room with her and had her in charge. She was about to address me, when I cautioned her, and told her that what she said would be repeated again to the magistrate. After this caution she said that she wished her baby was in heaven too. She added that she had seen so much trouble lately that she had no wish to live. She then said that she hoped that some letters that had been taken from her would not be shown in court; they were from the father of her last child, and he had no knowledge of what she was going to do with the children. She then said the father of the child was at Portsmouth, and he wished her to go to him; but she could not take the children with her, and she would rather see them drowned than in the charge of others. She then said that she took them down to the canal and threw them into the water, and they neither cried nor screamed. The prisoner added that she had told her sister that she was going to put the two

children to bed at Mr. Tollett's, and she asked me if people did not sink when they were thrown into the water. I told her I could not say, and she then said, "They did not sink, or else they would not have been found." She added, "I did not stay to look at them more than a minute."

Mr. Sleigh, counsel for the prisoner, said, the jury, he was assured, would not come to a conclusion that would entail such dreadful results unless they felt that the evidence was so entirely conclusive as to leave no possible doubt of the guilt of the prisoner; and the question for them to consider was whether all possible doubt was excluded, and whether they might not, under all the circumstances, feel themselves justified in returning a verdict that would have the effect of saving the life of the wretched woman whose fate was in their hands. The learned counsel then urged that, even supposing the jury should feel themselves compelled to come to the conclusion that the prisoner had thrown these unhappy children into the water, the act might very reasonably be considered as having been committed under the impulse of sudden frenzy, created by the miserable circumstances in which she was placed, and they would be quite justified upon the facts in saying that she was not responsible for the act. But the evidence by no means made out that the prisoner had thrown the children into the water, and all the facts that had been proved were equally consistent with the suggestion that the children had fallen accidentally into the water.

Mr. Justice Cresswell, in his summing up, said that no doubt it was the duty of counsel to exert

his best ingenuity on behalf of his client; but with regard to the suggestion that the children might have fallen accidentally into the water, there did not appear to him to be the slightest evidence to warrant any one in coming to the conclusion that this could have happened. As to the other defence that had been suggested on behalf of the prisoner—namely, that the act had been committed under the influence of some sudden frenzy, he could not help observing that it would be a most dangerous proceeding on the part of a jury to come to the conclusion that a person who had committed a dreadful act of this description was to be rendered irresponsible on the ground of sudden frenzy, when there was not the slightest evidence that the conduct of the party at any period of her life, or either before or immediately after the transaction, was such as in any manner to warrant such a conclusion being arrived at.

The jury, after short deliberation, returned a verdict of "Guilty."

Mr. Justice Cresswell passed sentence of death on the prisoner, urging her to make the best use of the short time that remained to her on earth. "I cannot," said the learned Judge, "encourage any hope in your mind, and the only duty that remains for me to perform is to pass upon you the sentence of the law."

The wretched woman, who appeared almost prostrated by terror and grief during the trial, now shrieked out several times, "I am innocent, I am innocent; oh, do have mercy upon me!"

10. THE ISLINGTON MURDER. *Central Criminal Court.*—Celestina Sommer, 24, was indicted for

the wilful murder of her child, Celestina Christmas.

The prisoner, although stated to be 24 years old, did not present anything of a womanly appearance. She is very short in stature, and looks more like a young girl than a married woman. The child with whose murder she was charged was more than 10 years old, and consequently the prisoner was not more than 14 years old at the time it was brought into the world.

The case stated by the counsel for the Crown is contained in the evidence.

Rachel Munt said: I am 16 years old. In February last I was in the service of the prisoner and her husband. They lived at No. 18, Linton Street, Islington. The only persons who lived in the house were the prisoner, her husband, and myself. I slept in the kitchen. I remember my mistress going out on a Saturday night about the middle of February, about 10 o'clock. Before she went out she told me she was going to Murray Street, and she would not be away more than half an hour, and she said she expected I should be in bed and asleep when she returned. My master was out at this time. I did not go to bed, but sat up in the kitchen, where I slept, to make a satin apron, and I was so engaged for about half an hour, when I heard the prisoner come in at the front door. She opened it with a latch-key. When I heard the door open I blew out the candle and got into bed. The prisoner came to the top of the kitchen stairs and called out, "Are you in bed, Rachel?" I made her no answer, and I heard the prisoner go up to her bed-room, and then come down again, and she had another dress on. Before she went up-

stairs I heard her voice in the passage as though she was speaking to some one, and I heard her say, "Wipe your feet;" and she afterwards told the person to go into the parlour, and I heard footsteps in the parlour, which was over the kitchen where I slept. The prisoner came into the kitchen where I was, and I then saw that she had a different dress on to the one she had gone out in. She drew the kitchen blind down. I saw this by the light of a lamp in the street. The prisoner had no light with her. After she had drawn the blind she went upstairs, and called to the person in the parlour to come down, and the deceased child and the prisoner came down together. The prisoner had a light with her at this time. She went through the kitchen where I was to get to the cellar. There are two cellars, one fronting the kitchen door, and the other under the area steps. The coals were kept in one of the cellars, but there was nothing in the other. The prisoner did not go into the coal-cellar. While the prisoner was in the cellar, I saw the deceased child standing at the kitchen door. I had seen her before, and knew she was the prisoner's child. The prisoner addressed her and said, "Come on, what are you afraid of?" The child replied, "I am not afraid, ma'am, but it is a strange place to me; I have never been here before." Immediately after this the deceased went into the cellar, and I heard her say that some one was going to cut her throat, and the prisoner replied, "Oh, was she?" and the little girl said "Yes." The prisoner then said, "Suppose I cut it;" and the child replied, "Oh, you are going to cut my

throat," and then called out "Murder!" This she called out several times, and said, "The devil will take you, the devil will take you; you will kill me, you will kill me; I am dying, I am dying." The girl then made a horrid noise as if she was breathing hard, and my mistress said, "Hush" several times. My mistress then put the candle out, came into the kitchen, and walked up and down in the dark several times and said to herself, "I will kill you; I will kill you; I will teach you to tell any more lies about me." She also said, "You are a liar, and you are a thief." While this was going on, I heard the child making a groaning noise in the cellar. The prisoner shortly after this came to the match-box that was by my bedside, and took a match and lighted the candle, and went into the cellar again. I did not hear the deceased make any noise after this. After remaining a short time in the cellar, the prisoner came out and said, "There you —, you must be dead now," and she then buttoned the cellar door and went into the back kitchen, and then she returned into the kitchen where I was and pulled the blind down. When she had done this she tapped me on the shoulder and said, "Rachel." I did not answer the first time, and she called me by my name a second time, and I turned round as if I was in a fright, and she then asked if I had been out before the master went out to get some soap, and I told her I had. She then said that she had been down two or three times to the cupboard to get some soap to take into the bed-room, and she also told me that she had been out to her greengrocer's to get change for half-a-crown to pay

me my money on Sunday morning. She then wanted to know if there was any hot water in the boiler, and I told her there was; and she said that she wanted to wash her hands. The prisoner then said to me, "I only owe you ninepence, and it is 11 o'clock, and I am going to bed." After she had said this, she went into the back kitchen, and I heard her washing something, and she appeared so engaged for nearly half an hour, and then went up-stairs into the parlour, and I heard her walking about there for some time, but I cannot say how long. She then went up-stairs to her bed-room. The prisoner's husband came home about 1 o'clock, some time after she had gone into her bed-room. I heard my master tell the prisoner that it was 1 o'clock when he came home. He had gone out at 8 o'clock in the evening. I got up at 8 o'clock on the following morning, and the prisoner came down about half-past 8, and she complained that the fire was not lighted and the breakfast ready, as it ought to have been. Some beer was usually kept in the area, over the kitchen door, and the prisoner fetched it at dinner time as usual, about 12 o'clock. In the course of the morning I went to the coal-cellar, and I had to pass the one where my mistress and the deceased had been on the night before, and I looked in. I had a candle with me when I went to fetch the coals, because I was afraid to go without one. The other cellar door was in the same state the prisoner had left it the night before. I opened the door and looked in, and saw the child lying on the ground, close to the cellar door, and I observed that her face and hands were all covered with

blood. I fastened the door again, and then went to fetch the coals. About 11 o'clock the same morning my sister came to see me. My sister is older than I am. The prisoner saw who was at the door, and she told me not to ask my sister down into the kitchen this morning, as she was busy, and my sister went away. She came again about 4 o'clock in the afternoon, accompanied by some policemen. I had told her in the morning something of what I had seen, but I could not tell her all.

Cross-examined. — I remained lying in bed after all this had happened, and made no attempt to get up. I was awake the whole night, and I am sure I did not doze off at all. My master was kind to me, but he was not very kind to the prisoner. It did not occur to me to get up and tell my master what had happened. I kept my eyes closed when the prisoner was in the kitchen, in order that she might think I was asleep. My master used to beat the prisoner, and she seemed to be very unhappy, and frequently cried. I had been in the service four or five months. The prisoner was not kind to me. She used to scold me, and say that I did not do things right.

Edwin Townsend, a sergeant of police, said: On the afternoon of Sunday, the 17th February, in consequence of information I received, I went to the prisoner's house. The sister of the last witness and an inspector were with me. I saw the prisoner coming up the kitchen stairs, and I met her at the top of them. She said, "What do you want?" I replied, "We want to look in your cellar." She said, "Look into my cellar! Good God, what for?" I made

her no other answer than that I wished her to go with us. Her husband was in the parlour, and he joined us, and we all went downstairs together. I procured a light in the kitchen, and proceeded to the cellar opposite the kitchen door. The door of the cellar was partially open, and on entering it I observed the dead body of a girl, apparently about 14 years of age. She was lying on her back with her face partially to the right, and there was a large wound on her neck, and a quantity of clotted blood underneath the neck and near the shoulders upon the ground. I said to the inspector, "It is all right, the body is here," and I then laid hold of the prisoner, and told her she must consider herself in my custody, for causing the death of the girl. The prisoner replied, "Me! I did not do it; I know nothing of it." She then said, "I heard a noise outside the area railings last night, but I did not tell you, dear (addressing her husband, who was standing by), because I thought it would make you timid." I then took her into custody. The husband was also taken, but he was discharged by the magistrate. I subsequently searched the house, and in the bedroom I found a black gown under the bed, and there was some blood upon it, which appeared to have been partially washed. I also noticed marks of bloody fingers on the cellar door, and also on the door leading into the kitchen. I also noticed some slight marks of blood on the upper part of the sheet of the servant's bed. There were also some marks of blood upon the lucifer-match box.

Rebecca Ann Donovan said: I am the female searcher at Hoxton police-station. I remember the

prisoner being brought there, and I was directed to search her person in an up-stairs room. While I was so engaged the prisoner asked me what she was brought there for. I told her she was brought into that room to be searched. I took off her dress, and on my looking down at her petticoat, on which there were marks of blood, she said she was subject to bleeding at the nose, and her husband could tell me that was the case. She then said, "There has been a girl found at my house." Before this she had said that she had a coal-cellar at her house with no coals in it; and she added, that a girl had been found stabbed in the cellar of her house, but she knew nothing of it.

George Beckley, a sergeant of police, proved that he went to the prisoner's house on the evening of the 17th February, and in the bed-room he found a pair of stockings, marked C. C., with blood upon them. On the same evening he also found in the cupboard of the back parlour a knife, with the appearance of blood being round the handle. There were no other knives in the cupboard.

The knife was produced. It was a large sharp carving-knife.

Joseph Hume, a police-constable: I was at the Clerkenwell Police Court after the prisoner had been examined on the 18th of February. All the witnesses, except the woman who had had the charge of the child, had been examined, and the prisoner was remanded. The prisoner spoke of her own accord, and said something about Hamlet and Richard the Third, and kept talking to herself for some time, and then she put her handkerchief to her head and said, in a low tone, "It was my

brother's child." She then said her brother had died, and after his death she took the child to keep, and paid 5s. a week for it out of her own pocket and out of her earnings by teaching music. She said she did not wish to put the child to service, as it was not big enough. She then said, "I did it. It is no use telling a lie about it. I did not know what to do for the best." She kept on talking for some time about her husband, and where they had lived before they were married.

Cross-examined.—The prisoner appeared to be muttering and talking to herself. She knew that I was in the room. The prisoner did not appear to be rambling, and she talked loud enough for any one to hear her. She spoke of the two children that were murdered in Richard the Third.

Mr. Coward, surgeon, said: I was called upon to examine the body of the deceased child. She was lying in the cellar quite dead. The body was on its back, and there were three wounds on the left side of the neck, extending from the back to the centre of the neck. The carotid artery was wounded in two places, and the hæmorrhage from these wounds was the cause of death. There were a number of superficial wounds upon both hands of the deceased. The knife that had been produced would very probably have caused the wounds on the body of the deceased.

Julia Harrington proved that the deceased child was born in her house, and that the prisoner was her mother. The child remained in her charge from the time of the birth until the 7th of February, when the prisoner took her away from her, and said that she was going to take her to her

sister in Murray Street. The child was called Celestina Christmas. She was ten years and a half old at the time of her death. The prisoner used to pay her latterly half-a-crown a week towards the support of the child, but at one time she used to pay her five shillings a week. The prisoner's name before she was married was Christmas.

Mr. C. Grover, an engraver residing at No. 16, Murray Street, Hoxton, proved that he last saw the child alive on the Saturday previous, at his own house. She had been there for about two days before. The prisoner brought her, and she fetched the child away about 10 o'clock at night, on the 16th of February. She said she had got a place for the child at a greengrocer's, as a servant.

Mr. Ballantine, for the prisoner, said that the case was of such a nature as almost to place the counsel for the accused in a position to be hardly able to decide what course to adopt, and to create a responsibility that he would very gladly have shrunk from encountering. He did think, however, that without reference to the dreadful consequences that must follow an adverse verdict, there were circumstances in the case that would justify the jury in coming either to the conclusion that at the time the act was committed the prisoner from some cause or other was not in a state of mind to be responsible for her acts, or else that she was not actuated by that malice required by the law to constitute the crime of murder, and that they might find her guilty of a lesser crime that would still entail upon her the most severe punishment.

The jury almost immediately returned a verdict of "Guilty," and Mr. Justice Crompton passed

sentence of death, urging the prisoner, who throughout the trial appeared to have suffered the most intense mental agony, to prepare by prayer and penitence for the doom she must so shortly meet.

The murder of her two children by Elizabeth Harris—a double murder—presents no one feature which can suggest that her sentence exceeded the requirements of justice; and the slaughter of her child by Celestina Sommer ranks as one of the most deliberate and cruel murders ever recorded. It was therefore fully anticipated that the doom of the law would be carried out in both cases—certainly in that of Celestina Sommer. To the great astonishment of the public it was executed in neither, both the murderesses receiving a commutation of their sentences. No reason has been assigned for this exercise of the prerogative of mercy. Some have suggested that the spectacle of the execution of two women at the same time was thought to be an unseemly exhibition under the rule of a female Sovereign. These unexpected reprieves excited much private and public comment, and were repeatedly mentioned in Parliament. The dissatisfaction long felt by the public at the uncertainty of the sentences of the courts of justice, and the still greater uncertainty whether the sentences passed would be really inflicted, was greatly raised. It was felt that this indecision had reduced our judicial punishments to a lottery, in which the criminal who drew a bad ticket was very unlucky indeed; while the new system of tickets-of-leave was thought to hold out to the most dangerous classes the inducement of a great excitement combined with practical impunity. In the

case of these two women, the feeling was much quickened by the report that Celestina Sommer had exhibited much indifference as to the result of her trial, expressing her conviction that she should not be hanged—only imprisoned.

13. THE SUNDAY BANDS.—The Government have renewed what proved an unfortunate experiment, by causing a military band to play from 3 to 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Sunday in Kensington Gardens. The performance was very acceptable, and about 50,000 people assembled, whose conduct was throughout exemplary. The arrangements were not particularly good, as the band was confined within such narrow limits, and were so densely surrounded by the crowd, that nothing but their caps could be seen and very little of the music heard. The selection of pieces, too, was far from unexceptionable, consisting chiefly of polkas, waltzes, galops, and things of a similar character. A refreshment pavilion was erected, and it was observed as a good symptom that a printed request to abstain from smoking near it or the band was very generally attended to.

The people plainly enjoying the music, the arrangements were extended, and military bands played on Sunday afternoons in both the Regent's and Victoria Parks. They were so great a source of attraction, that the attendance on one Sunday at these three places was estimated at 260,000 persons.

Very great disapprobation was, however, excited in the various religious bodies by these innovations, and strong representations were made to the authorities. The Government, however, still maintained them, and, by the mouth of Sir Benjamin Hall and Lord Palmerston, repeatedly declared that

they saw no harm in them ; until at length the Archbishop of Canterbury addressed the Premier in the following terms :—

“ Lambeth, May 10.

“ My Lord, — Your Lordship must permit me to address you on a subject on which I ought perhaps to have communicated with you sooner, but on which I can no longer be silent, either on my own account or on that of many of my episcopal brethren, who are appealed to very earnestly respecting the Sunday music in the Park.

“ It is with much reluctance that I interfere in a matter which has the sanction of Her Majesty’s Government, and in which a large class of persons is interested whom we should be most unwilling to deprive of any harmless gratification. But the letters and petitions which reach me daily, and call for an expression of my opinion either in Parliament or elsewhere, make it impossible for me to conceal from your Lordship the feelings with which these performances are regarded, and the offence which they occasion to a large and influential portion of Her Majesty’s subjects. These consider the question, as to their continuance or discontinuance, a vital question as concerns the national religion.

“ Concurring as I do in these sentiments, I feel it a duty which I owe to my station to represent them to your Lordship.

“ I have, &c.,

“ J. B. CANTUAR.”

Lord Palmerston immediately replied as follows :—

“ Broadlands, May 10.

“ My dear Lord, — I received your letter of to-day just as I was leaving London for this place. I

concurred in the arrangements for performances by military bands in Kensington Gardens and in the Parks for a couple of hours on Sunday afternoon, after divine service, because I thought that those arrangements would afford the inhabitants of the metropolis innocent intellectual recreation combined with fresh air and healthy exercise, and such recreation did not seem to me to be at variance with the soundest and purest sentiments of religion. Such was my opinion, and such is my opinion still ; for I have heard nothing on the part of those who object to these arrangements which has altered my view of the matter.

“ But I find from your Lordship’s letter, and from representations which have reached me from other quarters, that a great number of persons whose opinions are entitled to respect look upon the matter from a different point of view, and entertain in regard to it strong opinions widely different from my own.

“ In this state of things I am naturally led to ask myself, whether the advantage to be gained by a continuance of these musical performances is sufficiently great to compensate for the evil of running counter to the religious feelings of a large body of the community ; and to that question there can be but one answer—namely, that it is not. I shall therefore, in deference to the sentiments expressed by your Grace, on your own part, and on that of others, take steps for discontinuing the band playing in Kensington Gardens and in the Parks on Sundays. “ My dear Lord, yours, &c.,

“ PALMERSTON.”

The performances were accordingly discontinued.

The alteration produced much discontent among those who had enjoyed the promenades and those who advocate certain relaxations in the observance of Sunday in England, and it was much feared that the occasion would be taken to renew the disgraceful disturbances of which the Parks had been the scene in the preceding year. Nothing of the kind, however, occurred; but some persons raised a subscription for the performances of a private band, with which the authorities did not interfere, and the matter died quietly when the cold weather came.

11. DREADFUL BOILER EXPLOSION AT GLASGOW.—A terrible explosion, causing loss of life and destruction of property, occurred at the Clyde Grain Mills, Glasgow, on the south side of the river. These mills are situated on the west side of the street, and are closely adjoined by the brewery of Messrs. Rutherford and Co. On the south side of the courtyard was the boiler-house, a large one-story brick erection, in which were a boiler of 40 or 50 horse power, and an engine. The building was surmounted by a stalk about 200 feet high. On the north side of the yard was the grain-mill, and to the west a large cotton-mill. Adjoining the boiler-house on the south gable was the stable belonging to the mills, and contiguous the kiln, malt-house, and offices. About 7 P.M. this boiler exploded with terrible force—the boiler-house was blown to atoms; the furnace-stalk was completely knocked down; the south gable of the mills (three stories in height) was forced out, and extensive portions of the side walls and roof of the mills displaced and twisted. The engineman, Thomas Anderson,

who was in the engine-house at the time, was killed on the spot. In the mill one of the workmen was killed by the fall of the gable, the foreman miller had his leg broken in two places, and several others were more or less severely injured. By the force of the explosion the stable was blown to atoms, and two carters and a horse were killed. A little boy, playing in a close 150 yards off, was killed by the projected materials; the window and roofs of neighbouring houses were broken in by falling bricks and ironwork, and some of the nearest houses were much damaged—in one, the staircase was so effectually demolished that the inmates could only escape through the windows.

13. GREAT FIRE AT THE CALEDONIAN DISTILLERY, EDINBURGH.—A very disastrous fire broke out in the premises of the Caledonian Distillery, Edinburgh, by which machinery, stock, and buildings to the value of 30,000*l.* were destroyed. The premises, which belonged to Messrs. Menzies, Bernard, and Craig, had been recently built, and were fitted up, without regard to cost, with every appliance of modern science, and covered more than an acre of ground. The fire was discovered about 1 A.M., and spread rapidly. The fire-brigade could do little to check such a mass of flame, feeding on materials so combustible; and consequently before the fire could be got under, a large part of the building, machinery, and stock was consumed. The disaster is supposed to have arisen from the overheating of some part of the machinery. The romantic scenery of Edinburgh and its environs presented a beautiful spectacle while illuminated by the conflagration.

16. HER MAJESTY'S VISIT TO CHATHAM HOSPITALS. — The interest exhibited last year by Her Majesty in her visits to the hospitals of the sick and wounded soldiers from the Crimea was no formal and state proceeding, dictated by policy—it was the spontaneous emotion of a kind and wise heart. It has been exhibited in a thousand instances of charity unchronicled, because done with the total absence of ostentation. Upon some occasions, however, it was judged proper that the army should know that their Sovereign took a deep interest in their sufferings, and to-day a visit of a more official character was paid to the military hospitals at Chatham. Her Majesty had already inspected the general hospital at Fort Pitt, and the present inspection was given to the Brompton hospitals. Her Majesty, who was accompanied by Prince Albert and the Princess Royal, was received with a salute from the batteries, and by troops drawn up under arms. Nearly the whole of the barrack square has been given up to invalids. Within its ample space were drawn up 396 convalescent patients from St. Mary's, which it was not thought proper that Her Majesty should enter. Her Majesty passed through these poor men with gracious looks and kind words, and entered the hospital, where all who were able to leave their beds were drawn up. Most of them had medals, and some medals and four clasps. Each man had a card whereon were stated his services and his wounds. Extraordinary indeed were many of them—the most horrible nightmare could never suggest the wounds and mutilations some of these poor fellows have suffered.

One had received four dreadful wounds in the Redan, by which within a few minutes one foot had been shot away, then his chin was carried off, his shoulder was next pierced, and as he fell over his other foot was shot off. Another had had both his feet amputated in consequence of frost-bites, but as the operation had not cleared away the mortified parts he had soon after had both his legs amputated. Another had had thirteen pieces of his skull removed. A fourth had received thirty-one wounds in the cavalry action at Balaclava. The poor fellows who had received the most severe wounds received liberal donations from Her Majesty, accompanied by kind words and a manifest interest in the efficiency of the establishment, which shed a general cheerfulness around.

16. VILLAGE DESTROYED BY FIRE. — The village of Kenton, which consists of cottages inhabited by agricultural labourers, with the usual ingredients of the more splendid abodes of the doctor, the attorney, the publican, and the village *proprietaire*, and is distant about seven miles from Exeter, was almost destroyed by fire. About midday the thatched roof of a pig-stye in a court-yard behind the dwelling-house of a labourer, was discovered to be on fire. The wind at the time was blowing briskly from the east, and the thatch being exceedingly dry, the flames soon communicated to the cottage. From that they extended to other houses contiguous, and in a short space of time a row of seven or eight houses, including the Dolphin Inn, with several outhouses in the rear, were in a complete blaze.

Fire-engines from Exeter and from some private establishments

arrived. There was a copious supply of water from a brook which runs through the village; but the wind was so high that the burning embers which were scattered about ignited the thatched roof of a house at the corner of a street branching off from the main street; and not long afterwards the house of the surgeon, which was about a hundred yards distant, and which was separated from the burning premises by half-a-dozen slate-roofed houses, was found to be on fire. The flames extended so rapidly that the row of buildings in which this house was situated was speedily destroyed. In consequence of the wind, the fire spread with great rapidity along the thatched roofs, driving the dismayed inhabitants from their homes before they could remove their furniture. Twenty-five dwellings, with the greater part of their contents and very extensive out-buildings, were consumed. The consequences of the fire must be very serious to these poor people, whose capitalized property consisted chiefly in their homely furniture, and who had no idea of insurance.

17. ATTEMPTED ASSASSINATIONS IN RUPERT STREET.—An occurrence of a nature unknown to the natives of this civilised and temperate clime occurred in Rupert Street in the Haymarket—a round of attempted assassinations which more resembled the “running a muck” of the Malays even than the furious crimes of Italy. Owing to the escape of the perpetrator and unexpected recovery of the victims, no judicial investigation took place, and the circumstances of the affray have not been certainly disclosed.

In Rupert Street, Haymarket,

is a low coffee-house frequented by refugees, chiefly Italians. Among those who were accustomed to assemble there, were Francesco Rossi, Carlo de Rudio, and Pietro Chiesa, natives of the same part of Italy. One Foschini, from some other part of Italy, was an occasional visitor, but seems not to have belonged to the particular faction of the first-named. The waiter at the coffee-house was one Rouelli, who is stated to have been a man of respectable birth and education, but who, driven from his native country by participation in some conspiracy, gained his living here in this humble capacity. To this coffee-house, Foschini came on the evening of the 17th. It is not known what took place—there was probably some quarrelling—but Foschini declaring himself ill, Rossi accompanied him to seek a chemist's shop. On their way Rossi accidentally touched Foschini's trousers and discovered a hard substance, which he immediately knew to be a concealed dagger. He charged Foschini with the fact, and left him to return to the coffee-house. As he was about to enter, the assassin dealt him a blow with the dagger over the shoulder—after the approved Italian fashion—which wounded him slightly, and followed up the blow with repeated stabs. Chiesa, De Rudio, and Ruelli came to Rossi's assistance, and rescued him from the murderer, but so severely injured, that on staggering to a neighbouring surgeon's, he was thence conveyed to Charing Cross Hospital. In the meanwhile, Foschini deliberately turned off the gas, and in the dark commenced an indiscriminate attack on all present. Rouelli fell dangerously wounded in the abdomen, and cut

in many places; next De Rudio fell severely wounded, and then the assassin rushed into the street, followed by Chiesa; on whom the desperado then turned and struck to the ground with a severe cut in the abdomen. So furious were the actions of the assassin, that the by-standers shrunk from seizing him, and he slipped away. The sufferers were conveyed to the hospital, where Rouelli lay long at the point of death; but to the surprise of all his attendants his wounds healed, and he was discharged cured. The wounds of the others, though severe, were cured without difficulty.

In the meanwhile the exertions of the police to apprehend the assassin proved ineffectual. Whether it was that he was too closely connected with some secret society of emigrants, or whether it was the mere effect of nationalism, he was so effectually concealed, that he baffled the vigilance of the police, and has never since been heard of. A corpse was discovered floating in the river which was confidently asserted to be that of Foschini. But this seemed sufficiently disproved, and the ruffian probably escaped to the Continent.

18. HER MAJESTY'S VISIT TO ALDERSHOTT CAMP.—Her Majesty and Prince Albert have taken a lively interest in the formation of the camp at Aldershott, and have visited it several times during its progress; but the visit of Her Majesty this day was considered to be a formal recognition of its completion. Her Majesty left Buckingham Palace at an early hour, and on her arrival at the Farnborough Station was received by General Knollys, the commander of the camp, with a brilliant staff. On arriving at the

camp, Her Majesty exchanged her carriage for a chestnut charger, superbly caparisoned, and rode forward to inspect the troops. The army, consisting of many fine regiments of militia, and a large body of regulars of the line, amounted to 14,000 men, and were drawn up in two lines, presenting a front of a mile and a half in extent. Her Majesty, who was received with a brilliant flashing of presented arms, and the bands of about 20 regiments, rode down the front line, returning by the rear column, the front line in the meanwhile altering its formation to contiguous columns in brigade order. The inspection over, Her Majesty rode to an elevated point of ground, where, surrounded by a brilliant *suite*, she beheld the whole of this large body march by.

Her Majesty and the Royal Family slept in a handsome pavilion which has been erected within the camp for their accommodation. On the following morning they witnessed a splendid field-day. The troops, who numbered 18,000 men, occupied a range of barren heights known as Ladyhouse Common, and were minutely inspected by Her Majesty, who again rode her chestnut charger. Her Majesty's military costume consisted of a dark riding-habit, across which was the riband of the Garter, and across the left shoulder a sash of blue and gold. The troops were then put through a series of manœuvres on a large scale, under the command of General Knollys. The royal party returned to Buckingham Palace in the evening.

23. THE GREAT NAVAL REVIEW.—A naval review took place at Spithead in the presence of Her Majesty, on an unprecedented scale, both as to the amount of

force engaged and the number of spectators whom it attracted—to form, in reality, part of the spectacle. The visitors poured into Portsmouth and the neighbouring towns on the previous evening in almost incredible crowds, and those comical difficulties in finding sleeping accommodations which have been so often jocularly portrayed, were on this occasion most unmistakeably realised by many. On the day of the review, the spectators, to a number estimated at 100,000, crowded every wall, mound, ravelin, housetop, and

eminence of any kind between Fort Monckton on the west, and Southsea Castle on the east, including a grand stand erected near the latter, and many similar but smaller erections.

Daylight broke on a singular and stirring spectacle. The bosom of the Solent was occupied by the huge bulks of line-of-battle ships and heavy frigates, which lay moored in two squadrons, under the command of Vice-Admiral Sir George Seymour, whose flag was flying on the *Royal George*.

STARBOARD.		
Name of Ship.	Guns.	Horse-power.
Royal George	102	400
Nile	91	500
Conqueror..	101	800
Cressy	80	400
Cæsar	91	400
Algiers	91	450
Sanspareil.....	71	400
Centurion	80	400
Ajax	60	450
Hawke	60	200
Hastings	60	200
Imperiouse	51	360
Arrogant	47	360

PORT.		
Name of Ship.	Guns.	Horse-power.
Duke of Wellington	131	700
Orion	91	600
James Watt	91	600
Majestic	80	400
Exmouth	91	400
Colossus	80	400
Brunswick	80	400
Edinburgh	58	454
Hogue	60	450
Blenheim	60	450
Russell	60	200
Euryalus	51	400

To each squadron was also attached a long train of steam corvettes and sloops. The steam gunboats (the novel feature of the review) were anchored in four squadrons: the Red, commanded by Captain Codrington, C.B.; the White, by Captain Keppel, C.B.; the Blue, by Captain Yelverton, C.B.; and the Light, by Captain Key, C.B. The three first-named squadrons consisted of about 45 vessels each, of which a few were powerful vessels of 6 guns, and 200 or 300 horse-power, the rest were of 60 horse-power, and carried 4 heavy guns; the Light squadron consisted of vessels of very light draught, and carried 2

guns, with 20 horse-power. The whole of this immense squadron was “dressed” at 8 A.M., with every possible variety of flags from topmast-truck to the spars, which just cleared the water. The numerous yachts and other craft which the fame of the review had brought to the Solent, were decked with all imaginable bunting, which a light breeze expanded to the skies.

The spectacle commenced when the Queen’s yacht steamed out of harbour towards Spithead about 12 o’clock. At the sight a prodigious flock of private steamboats rushed forward, covered with flags and crowded with spectators,

whose vociferous cheers added a moral grandeur to the magnificence of the material spectacle.

Her Majesty steamed down and returned through the double line of men-of-war. As the yacht turned between the *Duke of Wellington* and the *Royal George*, those huge vessels opened a royal salute and manned yards. This manœuvre was taken up by all the ships of war in succession. The spectacle now presented was one of exceeding grandeur, and the yacht passed down and returned amid the thunder of guns and the cheering of the seamen on either side. This exciting exhibition over, the Royal yacht took up its station near the Warner Light, and a pause in the proceedings ensued.

Between 2 and 3 o'clock in the afternoon the gunboats steamed in distinct squadrons down the line, and passed up it again on the outside, passing in review before Her Majesty.

Soon after 3 the Royal yacht was seen standing towards the *Rodney* and *London*, anchored to the E.N.E. of the Nab Light as pivot ships; she was followed by the *Duke of Wellington* and the *Royal George*, the leading ships of the line; the rest following in their order of anchorage. They passed between the pivot ships, doubling back outside them, and returned in the same order to their former stations. No canvas was spread, which rather detracted from the beauty of the scene; but the immense screw men-of-war glided easily and silently along, apparently without aid or effort, and the manœuvre was perfectly performed. Fifty-five ships were engaged in it.

The Royal yacht, which had re-

mained outside the pivot ships, then returned towards Portsmouth, and took up a position in the rear of the line of gunboats, which were by this time (about half-past 4 o'clock) ready to begin a mimic attack on Southsea Castle. The signal being given, they opened a brisk fire on the devoted fort, directly in the faces of many thousands of stunned and delighted spectators under and in front of it. From the seaside little could be seen of this attack, which did not last so long as had been expected, the expenditure of powder being limited to six rounds from each boat; nor did the Castle return the fire, from considerations of the safety of those between the belligerents. After this cannonade, the Royal yacht returned to Portsmouth, and thus ended the maritime proceedings of the day.

A very interesting and novel display took place at night. The whole fleet was unexpectedly illuminated by simultaneously lighting up the yards and port-holes with blue-lights. This, in the calm stillness of the night, had a very imposing effect.

One incident of the day, ludicrous to all but those concerned in it, deserves to be recorded. The presence of the Lords and Commons of England was to have imparted a great moral element to the spectacle, and those august bodies were led to believe that very perfect arrangements had been made for their participation in it. By a combination of accidents and neglects, however, too complicated to be specified, they were delayed far from the scene of operations during the greater part of the day, and arrived there, literally, just in time to witness the termination of them.

The Imperial French navy was represented on the occasion by a deputation consisting of an admiral and a distinguished staff.

The vast naval force reviewed on this occasion consisted of 22 steam ships of the line of from 60 to 131 guns, 53 frigates and corvettes, 140 gunboats, 4 floating batteries, and 50 mortar vessels and mortar boats: the aggregate power of the steam-engines, 30,671 horses; and the number of guns 3002.

23. FIRE AND LOSS OF THREE LIVES IN FINSBURY.—A fire broke out in a poor lodging-house in an alley in Sun Street, Finsbury, in which three children perished. In the afternoon smoke was seen to issue from the windows of a room occupied by one Gallindi, a cabinet-maker. When the neighbours came to the spot, they found Mrs. Gallindi on the stairs exclaiming frantically that the house was on fire, and that her children would be burnt. On opening the room door the assistants were driven back by a thick black smoke; but two more daring than the rest succeeded in creeping in and dragging out the children by the feet; but they were all dead, having been suffocated by the smoke. It seems that the parents were in the habit of going out to work, leaving their three children, the eldest of whom was three years old, locked up in their room. It is supposed that the children got hold of some lucifer-matches, with which they set fire to something in the room, the dense smoke from which had suffocated them. Their clothes had not been on fire.

28. PROCLAMATION OF PEACE.—The *London Gazette Extraordinary* of this date contains the following proclamation of peace:—

“BY THE QUEEN.—A PROCLAMATION.

“Victoria R.

“Whereas a definitive treaty of peace and friendship between us and our allies and his Imperial Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias was concluded at Paris, on the 30th day of March last, and the ratifications thereof have now been duly exchanged; in conformity thereunto, we have thought fit hereby to command that the same be published throughout all our dominions; and we do declare to all our loving subjects, our will and pleasure that the said treaty of peace and friendship be observed inviolably, as well by sea as by land, and in all cases whatsoever; strictly charging and commanding all our loving subjects to take notice hereof, and to conform themselves thereunto accordingly.

“Given at our Court at Buckingham Palace, this 28th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1856, and in the 19th year of our reign. God save the Queen.”

The same *Gazette* also contains a proclamation of a General Thanksgiving to be observed on Sunday, the 4th May next.

On the following day, according to immemorial custom, the peace was proclaimed in London and Westminster, with the proper formalities. A strong body of the Life Guards was drawn up in the court of St. James's Palace, and the High Bailiff and beadles of the City of Westminster having arrayed themselves on either side, at a quarter to 12 the following procession emerged from the ancient portal:—

Knight Marshal's men, two and two.

Knight Marshal.

Drums.

Drum Major.

Trumpets.

Serjeant Trumpeter.

Pursuivants.

Serjeants { Heralds. } Serjeants
at Arms. { King-at-Arms } at Arms.

The procession having taken up its position, the heralds, attended by their pursuivants, thrice sounded their trumpets. Whereupon the Garter King-at-Arms (Sir C. Young) read Her Majesty's Proclamation.

Then the guns in the park commenced firing a salute, and on the first report the church steeples poured forth their merry peals. The heraldic procession, conducted by the officers of the bailiwick of Westminster, then marched to Charing Cross, where Garter again read the proclamation. The heralds then proceeded to announce the glad tidings to the City. When they arrived at Temple Bar they found the gates closed, and the usual formality of demanding and receiving permission to enter was duly gone through. As the procession had now arrived at the dominions of the civic potentates, the officers of the bailiwick did not attempt to pass those historic gates; but Garter and his train, conducted by the Lord Mayor and city functionaries, marched on to Wood Street, where the Cheapside Cross formerly stood, and there again read the proclamation; and again at the Royal Exchange.

29. CATASTROPHE IN CORK.—A terrible catastrophe, presenting many of the characteristics of Irish recklessness, occurred in Penrose Street, Cork. The city journal thus describes the locality:—

"We believe there are few but those whose hard lot it is to live in the wretched lanes which branch off either side of the North Main

Street who have the slightest conception of the misery, the squalor, and unmistakable signs of dilapidation and decay which encompass the visitor on every hand. With breadth scarcely sufficient to admit more than a single passenger, and much too narrow to permit of two persons walking abreast, the houses, dirty, dingy, and apparently for many years past going rapidly into decay, generally rise to the height of three stories on either side of those miserable alleys."

In one of these wretched burrows a man, named Patrick Sullivan, was holding a "wake" over the body of a deceased child, aged two years. His room was on the second floor, and was about 15 feet by 10. At 12 o'clock on Saturday night this room was crammed with friends—according to Sullivan's account there were 50 or 60 persons crushed within this limited space; a witness raised the number to 100—they were sitting on one another's knees and on the bed—not another could by possibility have found room. The wake commenced at 10 P.M., and was to close at 12 P.M. No doubt the whiskey had been circulated with the usual disregard of limit; but though one man was "going on with bad conduct and bad talk," it was declared that no one had got drunk within the room. At 12 o'clock, "just as witness's cousin was going to begin the forfeits," and "while a number of children were playing 'shuffle the halfpenny'" the floor began to give way at one end, and without further warning the whole descended, carrying with it the crowd of mourners, the youthful gamblers, and the corpse, on to the floor below: this floor was inhabited by two persons only, and

one of them was among the mourners, the other was absent. The shock and weight carried away this floor also, and the commingled mass crushed through to the basement. This floor was densely peopled, but the inmates were either at the wake or were absent, except one old woman, who, strange to say, was only injured. Within the walls, therefore, of the basement was the whole mass of human beings—men, women, and children, struggling, heaving, screaming—timber beams, bricks and mortar—the material mingled with and crushing the mass of human forms—the dead encumbering the living—the unwounded rising over and crushing the wounded and the helpless. Nor could any efforts of the frantic mass effect a liberation, for the pressure from within effectually closed the door and windows. The alarm spread rapidly that the house had fallen, and that all within had perished. This quickly brought the police to the spot, and by their well-directed exertions, aided by the zeal of the bystanders, the struggling creatures were withdrawn from the ruins. Eight were found to be quite dead; many were removed to the hospitals, of whom eleven died; and the number who had received such severe injuries as to become inmates of the hospitals was eighteen or twenty. The house presented a singular spectacle. The four walls were entirely unshaken; the garret floor remained sustained in its position without injury; but all below it and within the walls was completely torn away, and lay heaped in confusion on the ground below.

WRECK OF A CHILIAN WAR-STEAMER.—By the *La Plata* West India and Mexican mail steamer,

intelligence has been received that on the 30th January the Chilian war-steamer *Cazador* left Talcahuano, having on board 358 persons, 86 of whom were soldiers, four officers, and the remainder women, children, and the crew. Shortly after leaving she ran upon a rock and sank. Only 43 persons were saved, one of that number being a woman, the only survivor out of 148 women.

DREADFUL CATASTROPHE AT SEA.—The American journals received at this date contain a dreadful narrative of the wreck of the American ship *John Routledge*, and the fate of her passengers and crew. As the *Germania* from Havre to New York was on her passage, during which she experienced terrific weather, being among the icebergs near the American coast, on the 29th February, she observed a ship's boat tossing on the sea. A boat was sent to pick her up, and when reached she was found to contain a seaman, yet alive—the sole survivor of thirteen persons, of whom the remainder had perished of cold and starvation—and four of their dead bodies. When the miserable survivor of so many horrors had been sufficiently revived, he told a horrible tale, of which the following is the substance:—

The *John Routledge* was a fine barque of 1600 tons, belonging to a New York firm, employed as a regular packet between that city and Liverpool. She sailed from the latter port on the 16th January, with a cargo and 120 passengers, and with a crew of 25 officers and men. She encountered severe weather, and got among the icebergs. On the morning of the 20th February she struck upon an iceberg, which knocked a hole in

her bow. All the exertions of the crew and passengers were unable to remedy the disaster, and in the evening the ship was so full of water that it became evident she would founder. When the master gave orders for abandoning the vessel a scene of terror and confusion ensued, the crew and passengers contending for the possession of the boats. These seem to have been sufficient to carry all, with close stowage, and it would seem that they all had a small portion of food and water. Atkinson, the first mate, and some of the crew, were unable to gain places in the boats before the ship sank, and they went down with her. What became of four of these boats the rescued sailor, whose name is Thomas Nye, knew not—they separated each to take its own chance. The boat in which Nye was contained, besides himself, Mrs. Atkinson, wife of the first mate, the boatswain, a sailor, and nine passengers: they had 10 lbs. of butter crackers and a small vessel of water. There was a compass, but it was unfortunately broken. They had some bed clothing. As they pulled away with a single pair of oars, the full melancholy of their position seems to have been impressed upon the sailor; the passengers sat huddled in the middle of the boat, pale and speechless; the sea broke over them, and thunder and lightning rolled above them. When morning broke, the more strong-minded saw the necessity of control over the provisions. It was resolved that each should receive one cracker per day, and should drink the water through the cork. At their first meal a sensation of miserable mirth was felt, which died away into a conviction of their

almost hopeless state. For in truth they had no means of progress—they must drift at the mercy of the winds and waves until Providence should send some bark to them, or until—— The second and third day passed over them without incident. On the fourth, a brig was seen within two miles of them; but they were unable to attract her notice, and she passed by. The disappointment broke down the courage and resignation of the miserable people. They had believed in the possibility of rescue—their hopes had been raised to the highest point—their disappointment had been total. From this moment their hopes gave way—the strong despaired, the weak were prostrated. Their provisions could not last more than two days; their water was gone—all were suffering fearful pangs of thirst, and were benumbed with cold. On the fifth day a woman passenger died; her corpse was thrown overboard: it would not sink, and long floated beside its doomed companions. On the sixth day the husband of this woman died. On the seventh their sufferings overcame their prudence, the sight of water could no longer be resisted, and they drank of the sea! The draught heightened their agony: during the day a father and two sons died with frightful sufferings, and at night a sailor. On the eighth it rained; but the wretched survivors were too weak to catch the falling moisture, and but a small quantity was obtained, quite insufficient to soothe their raging thirst, now aggravated by their pernicious draughts of sea water. The boatswain and four passengers died, and at night Mrs. Atkinson. When day broke on the 29th

February, Nye was the only one of the thirteen that remained alive, and he had not strength enough to throw overboard the corpses of his dead companions. But in the afternoon of this day a sail was seen approaching, a boat was launched, and the miserable man was saved. He was almost dead of starvation and exposure, and his feet were frozen up to the knees. The crew of the *Germania*, on hearing that other boats might still be in the neighbourhood, lay till night, burning blue lights and firing signals; but nothing was seen of them.

FEARFUL SUFFERINGS OF A SHIP'S CREW.—The ship *Mercury*, arrived at Torbay, brings an account of the loss of the barque *Blake*, of Liverpool, and of the horrible-sufferings of her crew. The *Blake* sailed from the Mississippi for Cork on the 8th February. She was timber-laden. At first she had a fair run; but about the 4th March the weather changed, and she encountered a series of adverse storms, by which her spars were carried away, one man was washed overboard, and the vessel became water-logged. On the 13th March, while lying in this condition, she was struck by a heavy sea, by which she was capsized and seven men washed away: the decks were completely swept, and every article of provisions which they had got up was hurried off. The fury of the waves had, however, thus much of mercy, that they broke away the masts, so that the ship partially righted, and the miserable wretches could shelter themselves in some degree from the piercing blasts by crouching behind the bulwarks. They had not, however, a morsel of food or a drop of water, and the slight

covering they had found was no protection against the constant wash of the sea, which broke over the sides in foam or swept over the deck in sheets; nor could they make any effort to assist themselves, for such was the fury of the gale that they were obliged to lash themselves to the sides to save themselves from being washed overboard. For five days they continued in this dreadful condition, unable to move, constantly drenched by seas, pierced by the blasts, starving and thirsting. On the sixth day the gale moderated, and they succeeded in getting some water, and some pieces of canvas; but one of the seamen died of cold and starvation. On the seventh day they caught a half-drowned rat, which they divided between them and ate raw. On the eighth day they secured another cask of water. The ninth day passed without any prospect of relief. The rest of the dreadful tale shall be told in the master's own words:—

“Tenth day.—What a joyous sound was heard this morning, as the watch, at daylight, cried, ‘Sail, ho!’ and two vessels were seen, and every heart leaped with joy, but only to meet a heavier disappointment. The two vessels passed, one to windward and the other to leeward, without taking any notice of us. Oh, this disappointment was heartbreaking! with starvation staring us in the face, and the cries and the moans of the men around me, calling on their God to help them; with their glaring eyes and emaciated forms looking so pitifully towards me, as if I could assist them. The scene was awful and horrible, and cannot be described by pen; and in my situation I had to hold up against

everything to sustain them, that they might not give way to it. Many times I had to set my heart as hard as iron, to bear up against their cries and appeals to me as to what they should do, when I could have lain down and given way to grief and sorrow far deeper than themselves. To see those men, once so strong and robust, now nothing better than moving skeletons! To hear them smacking their lips and dreaming of being at some friendly table eating and enjoying themselves, as they would fall off into some of their dozing sleeps from fatigue, only to be awakened by the wash of a sea to behold their deplorable fate; then their cries and moans would be heartrending. They by this time began to get flighty, from weakness, and sores were breaking out all over us, from being constantly wet with salt water. In this way we continued until the thirteenth day, when we saw another vessel pass and take no notice of us. The wailing and moaning upon this day are too awful to be described. Thirteen days without a morsel of food of any kind to put to our lips! Another seaman died this day of starvation. We did not put him overboard, but reserved his corpse for our own use, and in this state we lingered for four days more, living off the body of our dead companion; but I must say very sparingly indeed, for the thoughts of it were almost as bad as death itself. Through these four awful days I do not see how we ever lived, not having a dry place to lie in, and the sea continually washing over us; and as some of us would drop off in our dozing state, dreaming of feasting, and be awakened in a few minutes by the wash of a sea, then, coming to a

sense of their situation, and the dead body of their comrade swinging in the pale moonlight, the cries and moans of the men were appalling. On Saturday, the 29th of March, we bore the heaviest and greatest disappointment,—a large ship passing us about two miles to windward, and not seeing us, it being too early in the morning. This was the seventeenth day since we capsized, and had nothing to eat but the dead body of our comrade, none of us hardly able to move from weakness and fatigue, and all our hopes gone. I laid myself down when the ship passed us, shut my eyes, and gave up all hopes of ever seeing land again, and was about resigning myself to my fate, when, about two hours after, I heard cries of joy from all of ‘Sail, ho! sail, ho!’ repeated in such a strain as will never be erased from my memory while on this earth. She proved to be the schooner *Pigeon*, Captain W. S. Knight, of St. John’s, Newfoundland. It blowing a strong gale from W.S.W. at the time, and a good sea on, they had some difficulty in removing us from the wreck, owing to our weak, miserable state. Our clothes, on being taken off, were completely rotten, being so long wet. We could pick them all off by pieces.”

Of this miserable ship’s company, eight were washed overboard, two died of fatigue and hunger, the master and seven men were rescued.

SALE OF MR. ROGERS’S COLLECTION.—The sale of the very celebrated collection of works of art, objects of *vertù*, &c., to the accumulation of which the late poet devoted so much taste and so many years, commenced on the 28th and occupied many days. It

attracted very general public interest.

On the first day the lots consisted of Egyptian, Greek, and Roman antiquities. Amongst them were the following, which brought the prices annexed:—A colossal head of Nephthis in red granite, inscribed with many hieroglyphics, which was found in the Thebaide, and which was of the date of the reign of Pharaoh Hophra, about 500 years B.C. (64*l.* 1*s.*). Several pairs of earrings in Greek gold, of various designs (about 18*l.* each). Several very beautiful fibulæ (about 20*l.* each). A pair of bracelets of blue glass in two pieces, each joined with a gold band, a gold lion and pine-cone forming the ends of each. These rare specimens were discovered in a tomb at Rome. They were sold for 40*l.* A necklace, composed of fluted beads of glass, of light blue, with a gold flower between each bead, from which was suspended a fruit-shaped gold ornament, a male bust of gold hanging from its centre (17*l.* 10*s.*). The celebrated golden bulla, formed of two curved plates, lentil-shaped, united by a third gold plate, bent double and bearing the inscription "Host. Hos." Mr. Rogers, in a note, gave it as his opinion that the Hostus Hostilius thus referred to was a relation of Tullus Hostilius, who, according to Ficcaroni, was the first boy who wore a bulla in Rome (56*l.* 14*s.*). A very fine large fibula, of a circular form, with raised centre, having circles of blue glass set in the inner rim, on which were female figures seated between ornaments, the outer circle being formed of discs and trefoil. This unique specimen was $2\frac{3}{4}$ inches in diameter, and was the gem of this part of the

collection (81*l.*). A portion of a rich necklace, formed of light flat plates, with Victory in a biga suspended from eighteen oval bosses, with double honeysuckle ornaments (51*l.*). The proceeds of the day's sale amounted to nearly 800*l.*

The most noteworthy objects offered on the second day were, an exquisite little candelabrum, found in the sea at Puzzuoli, representing a Roman lady seated in a chair, holding a cornucopia in her hand, and with a palm-stem rising from her head (51 guineas); a superb antique marble bust of the eldest son of Niobe, the chest and nose restored by Flaxman, found at Ostia (102 guineas); a mahogany pedestal executed by Chantrey when poor and unknown, working for 5*s.* a day as a journeyman (10 guineas); and, which was the important specimen sold on this day, Michael Angelo's two recumbent bronze figures from the tomb of Lorenzo de Medici at Florence, 18 inches long (180 guineas). A small terra-cotta model, by the same master, of the statue of Lorenzo, in the Chapel dei Depositi in the Church of St. Lorenzo, Florence, brought 28 guineas. Another valuable lot was a vase and cover of very elegant form, the surface covered with flowers and foliage in relief, 18 inches high (40 guineas). Besides these may be mentioned a beautiful cinque cento bronze on black pedestal, "The Fighting Gladiator" (30 guineas); an owl on a festoon of vine leaves, a beautiful antique mosaic (24 guineas); a model in terra cotta, by Harman, of the large statue at Petworth, "St. Michael subduing the Evil Spirit" (27 guineas); and a right hand of a female, in Parian mar-

ble, of which Mr. Rogers speaks thus: "a fragment of a hand introduced by Canova into the statue of a cupid in possession of Lord Cawdor. I have often seen Canova kiss that hand" (30 guineas). The sale realised on this day more than 1000*l*.

On the third day the first portion of the Archaic Greek vases was disposed of. The principal lot was a very fine amphora, believed to be unique, a warrior and female in a quadriga, accompanied by male and female attendants, a warrior and a female being seated both before and behind the chariot; the other side representing Theseus slaying the minotaur, a composition of twenty figures, entirely surrounding the surface. Beneath was a frieze of horsemen and hoplites, with Athenian and Bœotian shields, and, on the shoulder above, a combat. This rare and important vase had a false lining and two external spouts, one above and one below, for the purpose of cooling the wine. It went for 90 guineas. The following lots deserve to be recorded:—A fine ribbed œnochoe, with a wreath of ivy round the neck, the handle beautifully ornamented with leaves, a ram's head above and a mask of Medusa below (39*l*). A fine pelice, with a bride seated at her toilette, an attendant holding a wreath, a youth holding a speculum before a tazza, Leda with a swan, and Eros holding a cestus above; on the reverse a bridegroom seated, holding a speculum, a draped female, with a cista and a bunch of grapes before him, and Eros holding a cylix above; the border a Grecian honeysuckle on a black ground—a marriage vase of uncommon design, purchased in Apulia, 19

inches (23 guineas). A noble hydra, Hercules overcoming Nereus, the latter having a dolphin's tail; on the shoulder, three men leading horses; below, two dogs and a fawn, 15½ inches—a very fine design from Signor Campanari's collection (49 guineas). An amphora, the bearded Bacchus, in a quadriga, attended by a dancing Bacchante; on the reverse, the Dioscuri on horseback, carrying two spears each—an exquisite design (30 guineas). A very fine hydra, eight horses of the sun, drinking at a fountain, attended by two bearded men; on the shoulders above, three horsemen; below, three animals, 17 inches (34 guineas). Another magnificent hydra, Paris in helmet and white cuirass, sword in hand, seizing the statue of Apollo, which stands on a stone altar; beyond the column at the sides, the horses of a quadriga; on the shoulders a warrior in a quadriga, attended by five figures, 17 inches. This very fine vase was brought to England by Campanari, and, had it been perfect, would have realized a large price. It was unfortunately much damaged, and went for 12½ guineas. A calpis of Nolan ware, with a combat of two warriors, armed with spears and Bœotian shields; a frieze of honeysuckles round the shoulders, 13 inches (33*l*. 10*s*.). A tall amphora, with Theseus in a round cap, his club upraised, leading the bull of Marathon by a cord, a priestess of Minerva in a peplos, holding a prochus and a cylix before him and three draped figures behind; under the handles and on the neck Grecian honeysuckles, 17½ inches—formerly in the Prince Canino's collection (30½ guineas). A beautiful stannos, a race of two quadrigas, surrounded by birds of

omen; beneath, a dog; on the reverse, two priests of Bacchus and two Bacchantes seated among vine branches; on the shoulder five figures reclining on couches, a very fine Archaic work, 9 inches high (50 guineas). An *cœnochoe*, Apollo addressing Hercules, who is followed by a fawn, attended by two draped figures, a very fine design, 9 inches (20 guineas). A superb crater, with a priest of Hymen leading Amphi-rite, attended by two nymphs and followed by Poseidon; on the reverse, a woman with a lyre, holding a cylix, into which a priestess pours a libation, and two other figures. Purchased at Naples (40 guineas). A magnificent celebe, of Nolan ware, with a draped youth in a quadriga, met by a draped winged woman, who holds up her hands to stop the driver; on the reverse, three ephebi, 19 inches. This was purchased at Naples, and was the last addition made by Mr. Rogers to his collection of vases. It brought 16 guineas. The proceeds of the day were 1140*l*.

On the fourth day, the sale of the vases was resumed and concluded. The prices were as high as on the former days, and, indeed, were unprecedented in this particular department of antique art.

On the fifth day the sale of Mr. Rogers's collection of paintings commenced. The gem of the whole was Sir Joshua Reynolds's "Strawberry Girl." This was knocked down at 2100 guineas. "The Mob-cap," by the same master (the principal figure in the celebrated composition of the "Infant Academy") brought 780 guineas. The other pictures by Sir Joshua were a small, and very beautiful copy from Vandyke, portrait of the Marquis of Huntley in

a cuirass, full length, 55 guineas; a girl with a bird, the celebrated original, 230 guineas; a Girl Sketching, which formed the companion to the Girl with the Kitten, in the Earl of Normanton's collection, 230 guineas; and a romantic woody landscape in the manner of Titian, 105 guineas. By the last-named painter there were two pictures, Samson in the lap of Dalilah, from the Orleans collection, and Charles V. of Spain, in a suit of tilting armour, which sold respectively for 40 and 195 guineas. By Rubens there was Solitude, a landscape, Moonlight, the well-known picture from Sir Joshua Reynolds's collection giving so admirably the effect of the stillness of the night (310 guineas); and the Horrors of War, representing the artist as Mars in armour, followed by two of his wives and infant Cupids, who endeavour to dissuade him from following Bel-lona, Discord and the Furies—the same subject as a larger picture by this master in the Pitti Palace (200 guineas). By Giotto, the Virgin, seated on a throne with the infant in her lap, under a gold canopy, surrounded by angels (310 guineas). By Guercino, the dead Christ, watched by two angels—an exquisite replica on copper, of the picture in the National Gallery (115 guineas); a mother, with a child in her lap and a sparrow in her hand, on which the child intently gazes—from the Borghese Palace (315 guineas); a party of cavaliers and ladies on the bank of a river (35 guineas). By Salvator Rosa, Jason pouring the enchanted potion on the head of the dragon—from Lord Radstock's collection (32 guineas). By N. Poussin, the Adoration of the Shepherds (110 guineas). By

Rembrandt, a forest scene, with horseman and a beggar on a road—a favourite study of Sir Joshua Reynolds (250 guineas). The three following were hung over Mr. Rogers's writing table, on a level with his eye as he wrote:—The Virgin, seated, holding a book over the head of the infant, by L. Caracci (160 guineas); the Mill, by Claude, a shepherd playing on a pipe, seated beneath a group of trees near which goats and cattle are grazing (660 guineas); Raffaello's Christ kneeling in the garden of Gethsemane (450 guineas). Another Claude was sold for 135 guineas. It was the first picture purchased by Mr. Rogers, and came from the Orleans Gallery. It represents a grand archway of rich Roman architecture, with a party of cavaliers and ladies playing at cards on a terrace; a Roman villa with mountainous background, on the sea-shore, the whole under the evening sun. An exquisite miniature work by Van Eyck, spoken of by Waagen as "the *ne plus ultra* of delicacy and precision of miniature painting in oil," representing the Virgin seated in a Gothic niche, surmounted by elaborate Gothic tracing, in which are represented the seven joys of the Virgin in relief, brought 255 guineas. Palma's Virgin was sold for 315 guineas. A couple of Watteaus, a masquerade group of five figures, and a concert, both from Lord Carysfort's collection, sold respectively for 155 and 175 guineas. A Teniers, representing a group of five peasants, seated round a table smoking, before a cabaret, brought 101 guineas. Amongst the principal English works were the following:—Gainsborough's copy, made from an engraving, of

Titian's Cornaro Family (65 guineas). An early sea-piece of Turner, R.A., with fishing-boats off a wooden pier, a gale coming on (174 guineas). By Leslie, R.A., the two Children in the Tower at prayer—painted for Mr. Rogers (215 guineas); Sancho and the Duchess—borrowed by the artist while painting the picture in the Vernon Gallery (1120 guineas); and the First Lesson, painted for Mr. Rogers from the design by Raffaello (320 guineas). Sir D. Wilkie's Death of the Red Deer (375 guineas). The total amount of the day's sale was nearly 15,000*l*.

On the sixth day the sale of the pictures was resumed. The gem was a painting by Velasquez, of Don Balthazar, son of Charles IV. of Spain, on a black charger, purchased at the recommendation of Sir D. Wilkie. It sold for 1210 guineas. Amongst the other works disposed of were the following:—by Ann. Caracci's Coronation of the Virgin by the Trinity, formerly in the Pamphili Palace at Rome (400 guineas). By Correggio, the Virgin, from the Orleans Gallery. By Rubens, the battle between Constantine and Maxentius, one of 12 sketches formerly in the Orleans Gallery, (260 guineas); the Triumph of Julius Cæsar, from the Balbi Palace at Genoa (1050 guineas); the Waggon Landscape, with magical effect of evening sun, from the Marquis of Camden's collection (690 guineas). By Titian, the picture entitled, La Gloria di Titiano, which when painted owed its origin to a dream of Charles V., and which was held up before him, near his death, at the Convent of St. Yuste (270 guineas). By M. di Ferrara, Christ amongst the Doctors, mentioned by Lanzi

as a replica of a work in the church of St. Francesco at Bologna (500 guineas). By Teniers, the Enchantress quitting the Infernal Regions, from Lady Thomond's collection (300 guineas). By Murillo, St. Joseph embracing the Infant, a cabinet gem from Mr. H. Hope's collection (380 guineas); the Infant Saviour, holding a sphere, appearing to St. Francis, cabinet size (230 guineas). By Tintoretto, the Miracle of St. Mark, formerly at Carlton House (410 guineas). By Rembrandt, portrait of himself from Lord Carysfort's collection (310 guineas). By Paul Veronese, Mary Magdalen anointing the Saviour's feet, from Mr. H. Hope's collection (380 guineas). By N. Poussin, the Campagna of Rome (350 guineas). By G. Poussin, a woody landscape and a classical landscape, companion to it, both from the Colonna Palace at Rome (166 and 151 guineas). By Velasquez, Philip IV. of Spain in a black dress on a bay charger (205 guineas). By Gainsborough, an open landscape, a charming small specimen, from Lady Thomond's collection (250 guineas); and a very brilliant-toned rustic landscape (120 guineas). By Sir Joshua Reynolds, the Sleeping Girl, described as one of his richest performances by Northcote, who declared that he and Opie had great difficulty in placing it, when exhibited in 1787, its effect being so powerful as almost to annihilate every picture near it (150 guineas); the prospect from his window at Richmond, looking over the Thames, Marble Hall and Pope's Villa (430 guineas); the celebrated Puck (980 guineas); and Cupid and Psyche (400 guineas). Total proceeds of the sixth day, upwards of 15,000*l*.

On the seventh day the objects of art and *vertù* and the modern sculpture were presented. Amongst the former were the following lots:—one of the original 50 copies of the Portland Vase made by Wedgegood (127 guineas); a square tazza, silver gilt, with doves at the angles on fluted stem, weighing 139 oz. (67*l*.); another fine tazza and cover of Limoges enamel, with the passage of the Red Sea and triumph of David, &c. (60*l*.); a copy, in silver gilt, of Ariosto's inkstand, presented to Mr. Rogers by Lord Grenville, weight 63 oz. (46*l*.); Addison's writing table, of mahogany, with folding flap and draw, on tripod stem (13½ guineas); a beautiful agate cup and cover mounted, with silver gilt, chased, and open-work rims, on tripod stand and enamelled plinth (110*l*. 5*s*). A very rare Dyptic of early Limoges work, having on each side an ivory relief in three compartments; on the right, the Annunciation, the Nativity and the Baptism of Christ in leaf borders; on the left, the Pentecost, the Ascension, and Christ meeting Mary and Martha; on each side four double figures of saints in silver gilt of Byzantine character; the Virgin and Child, and the Saviour above and below; size of each leaf, 16¾ inches by 10 wide (251*l*.).

The following days' sale comprised sculpture, miniatures, cabinet pictures, drawings, engravings, illustrated copies of the poet's own works, and the drawings, engravings, and MSS. relating to them; together with many articles of genuine taste, and many which derived their merit from having belonged to the deceased poet. In fact, as the sale proceeded, the interest of the public rose to a very high point, and every article

brought a handsome price. The whole collection, including the books and illuminated works, produced upwards of 49,000*l*.

MAY.

2. EXHIBITION OF THE ROYAL ACADEMY.—The Exhibition of this year presented few works of very extraordinary merit, though, taken as a whole, it was considered to give a favourable view of the capability of the English school. Where such distinguished artists as Eastlake, Maclise, Cope, Mulready, and Herbert, do not exhibit, and the gallery nevertheless does not derogate from the high position this country has attained in art, it is evident that there is a vast amount of power and skill devoted to the Fine Arts.

The picture which attracted the greatest amount of public attention, was Mr. Hunt's symbolic scriptural study, entitled "The Scape-Goat." This picture presented in very remarkable degree the merits and faults of the Præ-Raphaelite school. A goat, wearing the scarlet fillet, worn, haggard, and exhausted, has rushed to the tempting shores of the Dead Sea: the salt incrustations of the doomed shore, broken through by its feet, and encasing the bones of many dead animals, explain the full bitterness of the lot of the fated goat; who, standing immovable, with its feet fixed in the saline crust, looks unutterable despair and desolation. Public opinion was much divided as to the merits of this remarkable performance. Those who saw in the fated animal no more than a goat dying of thirst on

the shore of a saline pool—and the picture did not necessarily exclude the prosaic and worldly idea—looked upon the performance with ridicule. Those, on the other hand, who appreciated the sentiment, overlooked the defects of the work by which it was conveyed, and placed it very high. Of the other pictures of the Præ-Raphaelites Mr. Millais' "Autumn Leaves," his "Enfant du Regiment," and "Blind Girl," charmed by their beauty and truth of colour, and their strict reproduction of some phases of nature, as much as they displeased by their faults of composition and the imperfect manner in which they told the story. Mr. Anthony's "Summer Eve," which, as true to nature as any of Mr. Millais, outraged the eye far less, and though a small picture, obtained much admiration. Of other pictures which gained public applause, may be named Mr. Stansfield's wreck-scene "The Abandoned," Mr. Frith's "Many Happy Returns of the Day" (a beautiful family scene), Mr. Ward's "Parting of Marie Antoinette and her Son," Mr. Elmore's "Charles V. at Juste." Mr. Leighton, who in a previous exhibition had given such large promise, this year exhibited a piece entitled "The Triumph of Music," taken from the story of Orpheus and Eurydice, which greatly disappointed his admirers. Not so Mr. Armitage's "Bottom of the Ravine of Inkermann," in which a singularly disagreeable subject was treated with remarkable power. Mr. Wallis's "Death of Chatterton," attracted much attention by the melancholy interest his treatment of the breaking of early dawn on the corpse of the unhappy poet threw over a painful subject.

The dark holé called "The Sculpture Gallery," contained little that could throw any light around its dark confines. Possibly Baron Marochetti's bust of the Queen, and Mr. Woolner's female figure named "Love," small, but very highly finished, deserve commendation.

6. FATAL EXPLOSION AT WOOLWICH ARSENAL.—Notwithstanding the strict discipline maintained in every part of the establishment, two very serious accidents have recently occurred in the Royal Arsenal, Woolwich.

On the 6th of May an accident occurred, the consequences of which were fatal. The workmen were busily engaged, under the superintendence of Captain Boxer, in the preparation of a vast quantity of rockets and other pyrotechnics for the great Peace festival of the 29th. Among the articles manufacturing were tourbillon rockets, intended to turn very rapidly as they rose; and as most people have seen them in operation, they will readily understand that great nicety is required in boring the central hole. This hole was bored through the metal case by means of a lathe and a steel bit; and it is supposed that the latter had become heated, for while one of the men was boring, the rocket took fire. It did not, of course, explode, but burnt as a firework, scattering sparks in all directions. There were in the shed a quantity of squibs and composition for filling star-shells, which ignited, and the consequence was, that most of the men in the shed were dreadfully burned—so much so, that three died after lingering in great agony.

On the evening of Saturday, the 17th instant, a loud explosion was

heard from a portion of the works, which brought to the gates a crowd of persons connected with the workmen within: a very serious accident had taken place. It originated in a temporary shed about 10 feet square, in which the process of mealing the detonating composition with which the percussion caps are charged, and which is a thousand times more ignitable than the ordinary gunpowder, is performed. Two persons were in the shed at the moment—a man named Flack, foreman of the department, and a boy named Shylock, and both were killed instantaneously. Two labourers working near were also killed—they were indeed blown to pieces: the right leg of one was blown into the roof of another department, and one arm was broken in four places. Seven other workmen were taken to the hospital, of whom one died.

6. EXTRAORDINARY ACCIDENT AT THE WEST INDIA DOCKS.—A very extraordinary accident was occasioned by the north-east gale, which blew throughout the night, to the south West India Dock, perhaps better known as the City Canal. At the Limehouse end of the canal the outer gates of the lock were under repair, and the whole pressure of the water was sustained by the inner pair. During the evening the wind set in strongly from the north-east, blowing directly up the canal, and causing some swell at the Limehouse extremity. A number of laden barges and lighters were lying in the vicinity of the entrance waiting to go out of the dock at the flood. About half-past 9 the tide in the river was nearly at its lowest ebb, the entrance lock as far as the inner gate was almost dry; on the other

side of the gate, that is, within the dock, there was a depth of water of about 20 feet. Suddenly the whole neighbourhood was aroused by a tremendous crash, caused by the bursting of the lock gates. The whole of the ponderous gates, probably weighing 20 tons, were crushed outwards and swept in fragments into the river, and the waters of the canal burst down into the lock with overwhelming fury. With the torrent were swept away craft of every description; grain-lighters, barges, monkey-boats, dredging machines, diving-bell barges, rafts of timber, and other floating masses, all came down in one mass. Some were sunk and their wrecks carried into the Thames; others were thrown over each other in confusion. Numerous merchant ships were lying at the various jetties, at each side of the canal, and many of these, as the torrent swept along, were carried away from their moorings, and sustained considerable damage through coming in collision with each other. Great anxiety was manifested for the larger ships; but these quickly grounded in the mud, and sustained no damage; others, on the canal running dry, were left in a critical condition, and, being heavily laden, were no doubt much strained. Many of the lighters were capsized and sunk, and where their cargoes were of a perishable nature great loss was sustained; for instance, a Dutch galliot, containing 700 quarters of grain, was sunk, and the whole destroyed. The rush of water from the canal was greatly increased by the water from the timber floats, which cover 16 acres. Nevertheless, the whole of this immense quantity was poured through the lock gates

and the canal left dry in about 10 minutes. The loss to the Company is very great.

19. LOAN OF 5,000,000*l.* — A new loan of 5,000,000*l.* was this day negotiated with Messrs. Rothschilds. The terms proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer were:—the amount of loan to be 5,000,000*l.* sterling in Consolidated Three per Cent. Annuities, which would be given for every 100*l.* subscribed in money. Interest to commence from the 5th of January last: payments as follow:—deposit of 10*l.* per cent. on May 22nd, 20*l.* on June 12th, 20*l.* on June 28th, 20*l.* on July 24th, 10*l.* on August 28th, and 20*l.* on September 18th. For each instalment after the deposit, stock to be created for the subscribers, and for the deposit at the period of creation for the last instalment. Scrip receipts to be issued in the usual manner.

At a preliminary interview with the leading capitalists, the Chancellor of the Exchequer stated that he did not contemplate a funding of Exchequer bills or sale of savings'-bank stock; that he intended no further loan in consols, and that should any further sum be required, it would be limited to 2,000,000*l.*, and would be raised by Exchequer bonds or bills to be issued at the end of the present or the beginning of the next year. The proposal with these explanations was very favourably received in the City, and consols slightly advanced. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was met at the Treasury by the leading capitalists. Baron Rothschild alone offered a tender—his terms were 108*l.* consols for every 100*l.* money, equivalent to consols at 92½ nearly. These were below the *minimum*

fixed by the Government; which were 107*l.* 10*s.* 7*d.* consols for every 100*l.* money—equivalent to consols at 93. Baron Rothschild and his friends retired for a few minutes, and then accepted the Chancellor of the Exchequer's terms. Consols were this morning at 94 $\frac{1}{4}$, and there was, therefore, a direct profit to the contractors of 1*l.* 5*s.* per cent., and the scrip was immediately quoted at premiums of 1 $\frac{1}{4}$, 2 $\frac{1}{8}$, and 1 $\frac{7}{8}$, 2. In consequence also of the announcement that the Government would require no further loans, the funds rose, and the general aspect of monetary affairs became buoyant. Besides the very handsome profits which the transaction would evidently yield, the moneyed gentlemen would have pocketed some 18,000*l.* without trouble had the Chancellor of the Exchequer accepted their terms. It is said that the amount of subscriptions sent in to Messrs. Rothschild was 40,000,000*l.*

24. ACCIDENT ON BOARD THE NIMROD STEAMER AT CORK.—A dreadful accident occurred on board the Cork Steamship Company's steamer *Nimrod*, which arrived at Cork at 5 o'clock A.M., with deck and cabin passengers and cargo from Liverpool. On arrival at the quay it was the duty of the engineer to ease the safety valves and allow the steam to escape. From whatever cause, this most necessary duty was neglected, and immediately after the vessel had arrived at the quay, and before the plank had been placed to enable the passengers to land, a violent explosion of the boiler took place. One side of it was completely rent asunder, and volumes of scalding steam poured forth into the engine-room. The

passengers, ignorant of the real nature of the calamity, and apprehending that the steamer would immediately sink, rushed to the fore part of the vessel, and several attempted to jump overboard. The first person who ventured to descend to the engine-room was one of the firemen, who having been let down the ladder, crept upon his hands and knees to avoid the steam which had risen to the upper part of the room. When he entered it six unfortunate men lay on the floor in intense agony, the steam having scalded every portion of their bodies and seared the flesh in the most fearful manner. They were conveyed on deck by attaching ropes to them and hauling them up by a windlass. Such were the extent of the injuries they had received, that before 7 o'clock all the sufferers had expired. The bodies presented a fearful spectacle. The skin had peeled off, and exposed the flesh, which in many places was detached from the bone. The eyes were boiled out of the sockets, and most of the bodies exhibited a frothy exudation from the mouth.

27. EPSOM RACES.—The great meeting held its festivities this year under influences by no means propitious, and in consequence, except on the Derby and Oaks days, the attendance was scanty and businesslike. The Craven Stakes were won by Sir John Hawley's "Kalipyge." The Derby Stakes by Admiral Harcourt's "Ellington." 213 subscribers; 24 started. On Friday the Oaks Stakes were won by Mr. H. Hill's "Mincepie." 136 subscribers; 10 started.

WRECK OF THE SHIP *PALLAS*, AND LOSS OF EIGHTY-TWO LIVES.—The ship *Pallas*, from Cork for

Quebec, with emigrant passengers, was wrecked at St. Paul's Island, and 82 lives were lost. The *Pallas* sailed on the 28th April, with 136 steerage passengers, and had a good run to the entrance of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. On the night of the 30th May, about 10 o'clock, during a thick fog, with moderate breeze, the ship running at the rate of four and a half knots, she struck on the south side of St. Paul's. The life-boat was got out, and every person on board, as well as the baggage, might have been saved, but the passengers rushed into the boat, and no persuasion could induce any number of them to leave her. The boat in consequence was stove in, and all on board drowned. The master and the remainder of the crew and passengers stood by the wreck until the morning, when they were safely conveyed on shore in boats from the island. The captain crossed to Sydney, and hired the schooner *Nazare* to bring up the survivors to Grosse Isle, when they were transferred to the regular steamer, and arrived at Quebec in safety. Seventy-nine passengers, and three of the crew—in all 82 lives—were lost.

29. CELEBRATION OF THE PEACE.—On this day, amid general suspension of business, and universal enthusiasm, was publicly celebrated the conclusion of the Treaty of Peace. During the whole of the day the leading thoroughfares were crowded by holiday-making pedestrians, some crowding to witness the military pageant of the morning, some surveying the preparations for the street illuminations, some watching the arrivals at the Queen's Drawing Room, and some hastening to take up positions for witnessing the great

pyrotechnic display of the evening.

The proceedings were inaugurated by an inspection of the Foot Guards in St. James's Park, at which H.R.H. Prince Albert and H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, and many officers of distinction assisted. This, however, was only the ceremony customary on Her Majesty's birth-day, which was kept on this day.

The great celebration consisted in the displays of fire-works which took place in the evening, and drew almost countless multitudes to each of the four distant localities at which, in order to make them as generally accessible as possible, they were exhibited. The places chosen were Hyde Park, the Green Park, Victoria Park, and Primrose Hill. At all of them the programme was identical, the crowds were equally immense, and the display equally splendid. The hour appointed for commencement was 9.30 P.M., and precisely at that time the entertainment began with a series of illuminations, with white, green, red, and yellow fires, and a continuous discharge of maroons. For two hours afterwards the horizon of the north metropolis was luminous with the blaze of suns, stars, comets and streamers, the flight of rockets, shells, and Roman candles, the descent of meteors, parachutes, and showers of pearl, silver and golden rain. Shining serpents and fire-flies chased each other through a sea of light, and ingenious contrivances with hard technical names flamed against and athwart the sky in every variety of movement. The eye was constantly dazzled by the intensity of the light, and the effect of colour in some of the devices was

magnificent. "The bright green emerald, the pale sapphire, the gay amber, the pure topaz, the sweet-tinted amethyst, the rich garnet, the blue turquoise, the dark *lapis lazuli*, the rare jacinth, the elegant onyx, the delicate opal, the gaudy gold and the brilliant diamond, all gay and glittering colours were there combined, presenting a dazzling profusion of tints such as the eye could never tire to look upon." The programme was a rather long one, and included everything that was either new, curious or beautiful in pyrotechny. It consisted of twenty-four divisions, which were most uniformly subdivided into three parts; the first of which included the fixed pieces, the Roman candles, the streamers or mines or tourbillons or squibs; the second, the rockets; and the third shells of various effect. Some of the fixed pieces were remarkably elegant. The stars, hoops, and crosses elicited the most enthusiastic expressions of delight, and indeed nothing could have been finer. Those rockets which, exploding in the air, threw out clusters of coloured stars, were also much admired, and loud cheering burst from all sides when a number of shells, discharged together, burst far above the heads of the spectators; changing into graceful and glittering forms which charmed the eye and filled the air with light; cascades, fountains and trees and bouquets were represented with wonderful exactness, and—perhaps one of the most beautiful features of the display—the formation in the air of sheaves of yellow corn. But the great triumph of the night was the display which concluded the exhibition. It consisted of five fixed pieces, all of the most ingenious and elaborate

construction, the last bearing the words, "God save the Queen," illuminated in the centre. Simultaneously with this there was a grand discharge of Roman candles, battering of pearl streamers, tourbillons and rockets in red, blue, green and yellow, discharged by preconcerted signal from each of the four stations. The effect was magnificent; and, when, in addition to the above, no fewer than 10,000 rockets were shot into space, the scene was such as can be witnessed only once in a lifetime.

Considering the countless crowds of people, and the immensity of the display, it was impossible to avoid accidents altogether. Several persons were struck by the descending rocket-sticks, and in two instances death was the consequence. Several persons lost the sight of an eye.

The illuminations of the streets in the evening were general and brilliant, and from the Parks on the west to the Royal Exchange on the east, all the leading thoroughfares were literally packed with pedestrians and vehicles, from 9 o'clock in the evening till 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning.

30. COLLIERY EXPLOSION IN GLAMORGANSHIRE.—An explosion of fire-damp occurred at the Ynisdavid Colliery, owned by the Governor and Company of Copper Mines at Cwmavon, Glamorganshire. A portion of the mine had been long known to be in a dangerous condition, but all due precautions had been taken by the proprietors and their agents. The explosion took place at about 10 o'clock in the morning, when about 60 or 70 hands were at work in the pit. The men who were working above ground were greatly alarmed by hearing sounds which

informed them that something had happened below. Some of them immediately descended the shaft, and found that a terrible explosion had taken place in the big vein, and that many of the work-people were either killed or hurt. Twelve were got out with as much speed as possible. Eight of them were dead when brought up, and the other four died some hours afterwards. One of them had had his head and one of his arms completely torn away from his trunk, and others were bruised; but the majority had evidently died from the suffocating effects of the poisonous gas, as, beyond being scorched, no marks of injury were found upon them.

The sides of the vein gave terrible indications of the great violence of the explosion. A very heavy coal cart was completely crushed by it.

30. GREAT INUNDATIONS IN FRANCE. — Immense inundations have occurred in France, causing destruction and affliction to a frightful extent. Rain fell in almost incessant torrents during Friday and Saturday, laying whole departments under water.

From Paris to Lyons and onwards to the sea, the streams, large and small, overflowed their banks. The country round Chalons, Tours, Macon, and Lyons looked like an inland sea. The valleys of the Loire, the Rhone, the Saone, the Isère, the Veoure, and their tributaries, were laid under water. The inundation spread out in vast sheets, dotted with the roofs of houses, the bushy tops of willows, and the tall spires of the poplar; in other places it gathered all its strength, and rushed along in a torrent, carrying all before it. Roads and railways were rendered impassable. Human

bodies, cattle and furniture, agricultural produce and farm buildings, were borne along the flood. The streets of many towns were only passable in boats; through the Rue Massena at Lyons, the water rushed like a cataract. The damage done in that city was prodigious. At the Brotteaux several houses were washed down before the inhabitants could be got out of them. The embankments of the Rhone were broken down by the weight and force of the waters, and all the lower quarters of Lyons were inundated. In some places, people, surprised in their sleep, hurried out, half dressed, and had to wade to shelter. Troops were constantly on the move lending assistance, and cavalry were out giving warning. The rise of the Loire followed that of the rivers of the south, and by the end of the next week, the central and western departments were deluged. Some idea of the extent of the calamity may be formed from the following facts. When the Emperor was at Lyons he had to give up his horse and go from place to place in a boat. Viewed from the tower of Arîmes near Arles, the whole country between the city and the sea seemed to be under water. A steam-boat passed over the Carmagne, a tract of land near Arles, picking up persons from the roofs of isolated houses, and saved the lives of 60 persons. Many of them had been thirty-six hours without food. As the water drained from the low-lying parts of Lyons, numerous bodies were found in a state of decomposition. At the Orleans railway station, the water reached the fourth story. At Tours railway station it was ten feet deep, and as far as the eye could reach, the adjacent country was covered

with it. On the Rue Royale in that city, boats plied constantly. Saumur was isolated. The waters filled the immense slate quarries at Angers, and threw ten thousand people out of work. In some places whole villages were swept away.

At the commencement of the floods, the Emperor resolved immediately to visit the afflicted districts, and set off from St. Cloud on the Sunday. Arrived at Lyons, he rode over the inundated portions, cheering the people, and stimulating the troops and people to strenuous exertions. Thence he continued his journey along the Rhone, visiting all the towns in his way, and constantly relieving the distressed with his own hand. He returned to Paris on Thursday, and at the end of the week endeavoured to go down the valley of the Loire, but was stopped at Tours by the floods. But on Sunday he resumed his efforts, and was occupied till Wednesday in travelling about the inundated districts, generally on horseback, with a large leather bag before him, from which he distributed gold with his own hands to the unfortunate people around him.

At a sitting of the Legislative body, 2,000,000 francs were voted for the relief of the sufferers, and the Council of Ministers applied a new credit of 10,000,000 to the same purpose. Public subscriptions were set on foot in all directions. One was raised in England, which amounted to nearly 40,000*l*.

After the inundations had subsided, the Emperor addressed a letter to M. Rouher, the Minister of Public Works, in which he examined, from an engineering point of view, the causes of the occasional overflow of the great rivers, and recommended, in order to

prevent the recurrence of such disasters, the barrage of the affluents of those streams. He also directed the Minister to cause a technical survey of the river valleys for the purpose of making such constructions.

31. ERRONEOUS CONVICTION.—

At the Central Criminal Court, John Markham, 24, a well-dressed respectable-looking young man, was indicted for forging and uttering an order for the payment of 91*l*., with intent to defraud Messrs. Smith, Payne and Smith, bankers.

The counsel for the prosecution, on opening the case, described it as one of a peculiar and unusual character, and he said the jury would entertain no doubt, when they heard the facts, that a most ingenious and artful fraud had been committed, and that the only question would be, whether the prisoner was the guilty party.

Mr. C. F. Ash deposed that he carried on the business of an oven merchant in Upper Thames Street. In the beginning of the month of February last, his premises were broken open, and a good deal of property stolen. Among other things that were taken, two blank cheques were cut out of his cheque-book. The cheque for 91*l*., now produced, was a forgery, and he believed it was drawn upon one of the cheques that were stolen on the night of the burglary. Bills and other papers, which might have afforded the guides for imitating his signature, were taken at the same time. He knew nothing whatever of the prisoner.

A young man named Humphreys was examined, who stated that on the 18th of February, he put an advertisement for a situation in *The Times*, and a day or two afterwards he received a letter request-

ing him to call upon a Mr. Hammond, at No. 6, Oakley Crescent, City Road, and he went there and saw the prisoner. Having made some inquiries of him, he said that he was engaged in business at Oxford and London, and that he was continually backwards and forwards, and that he should want him to drive and look after a horse and chaise, and he also told him he should want him to live at Oxford. Witness objected to this, and said he did not think the situation would suit him, and the prisoner asked him to consider of it until the following morning, and, if he still declined, he should be glad if he would execute two or three little commissions for him. He went the next morning accordingly, and told the prisoner that the place would not suit him, and the prisoner then asked him to go to the Euston Square station and ask for Mr. Hammond's luggage. He went as he was directed, but no such luggage was there, and upon his return, the prisoner expressed his surprise that his luggage had not arrived, and then handed him a cheque for 91*l.* upon Messrs. Smith, Payne and Co. He went to the bank with the cheque and presented it, but the cashier did not pay it, and he was taken into a back office, where he was questioned, and in consequence of what he said he was taken to the office of Mr. Mullens, the solicitor. He subsequently went to the house in Oakley Crescent, accompanied by John Forrester, the officer, but the prisoner had gone away.

This witness was cross-examined at considerable length by Mr. Ballantine, with a view to show that he was mistaken in his identity. He said that he did not see the prisoner again until the beginning

of March, when he was in custody. He was taken to the House of Detention, where the prisoner was under remand, and shown a number of prisoners in different cells, and among them the prisoner; but he did not recognise him until he was told that he had passed the man he was expected to identify, and he then said the prisoner was like the man who had given him the forged cheque. He saw him afterwards at Marlborough Street police-court, and he then was certain he was the same man.

Miss Fennell, the landlady of the house in Oakley Crescent, deposed that a man, whom she believed to be the prisoner, engaged her apartments about the 20th of February. He only remained a day or two, and left without any notice.

In answer to questions put to her, this witness said that the man had black patches in different parts of his face, and wore spectacles, so that his features could not be seen very readily, but she had no doubt the prisoner was the same person. She admitted that, in the first instance, when she was questioned upon the subject, she expressed a doubt whether the prisoner was the same man, but she said the reason for doing so was that she did not desire to appear as a witness.

Evidence was then given that on the 8th of March, a young man named Bowles advertised for a situation, and received an answer dated from 16, Stanhope Street, Regent's Park, and signed "E. Bates," requesting him to call upon him. He went accordingly, and saw a man whom he stated to be the prisoner, and he was requested by him, as in the former case, to go to the railway station to inquire for

luggage, and then he gave him a cheque for 87*l.* 14*s.* upon Messrs. Ransom and Co., Pall Mall, and told him to get four 10*l.* notes and 47*l.* in gold. He went to the bank and received the money, and took it back to the prisoner, who made an appointment for him to come on the following day. He shortly afterwards, however, received a letter from the prisoner, stating that he was obliged to go out of town, and he would write to him when he required his services. This excited Bowles's suspicions, and he communicated with the bankers, and the forgery was then discovered. He saw nothing of the prisoner until the 19th of March, when he met him walking with another man in Oxford Street, and when the prisoner observed him he turned his head away. Bowles, however, went up to him and asked him if his name was not Bates, and he said it was not, his name was Hawkins, and he and his companion walked away. Bowles continued following them, but before he could meet with a policeman they succeeded in getting away. He met the prisoner again a few days afterwards, near the Edgware Road, and he then gave the prisoner into custody upon the charge of uttering a forged cheque. He first gave the name of John Hawkins, but afterwards he said that his name was Markham, and that he lived in Chapel Street, Pentonville. The prisoner, it appeared, became very violent, and attempted to strike the young man Bowles. He was then taken to the house in Stanhope Street, and upon the servant seeing him she said that, if he was not the man who had taken the lodging in the name of Bates, he was his brother, and the prisoner upon this renewed his vio-

lence, and so alarmed the girl that she fainted away, and the officer who had him in custody was obliged to threaten that he would call in the assistance of other constables, before the prisoner could be at all quieted.

Mr. Ballantine, at the close of the case for the prosecution, addressed the jury for the defence, and contended that they would not be justified upon the evidence before them in finding that the prisoner was the man who had sent the forged cheques; and that the evidence as to his identity was not to be relied upon.

The jury, without any hesitation, found the prisoner "Guilty." The police now stated that the prisoner was well known as a "skittle-sharp," and an associate of bad characters. He was sentenced to four years' penal servitude.

Notwithstanding the certainty with which so many respectable witnesses identified the prisoner, it was distinctly proved that the unfortunate man was entirely innocent, and that the real offender was one of the formidable gang of forgers, the leaders of which were apprehended later in the year;—and it seemed also that he was not otherwise the disreputable character represented. He received Her Majesty's pardon; but the poor fellow had been subjected to the uttermost ruin that one of his class can sustain. His distracted wife had sold every article of furniture to provide counsel for her husband, and had been reduced to starvation. The poor fellow had been subjected to intense moral torture. In Newgate he had been compelled to pick oakum with three murderers and numerous other felons, who had subjected him to gross atrocities for his assertion of

innocence. In Millbank he had been subjected to the dreadful system of separate confinement: in Pentonville to solitary confinement.

The case excited great interest, and raised the question whether it was consistent with justice to *pardon* a man who was entirely innocent, whether he ought not to be brought before the Court which had convicted him and proclaimed innocent—and whether the country, which had wrongfully punished him, ought not to assign him compensation. A considerable subscription was raised in this case in compassion for his sufferings. It is a singular example of the inconsistency of the human character, that the person for whose guilt Markham was suffering, sent to Markham's wife in her distress a 5*l.* note, by concealed hands.

JUNE.

1. MURDER OF A SERGEANT-MAJOR IN PLYMOUTH SOUND.—A murder took place on board the hired convict-ship, *Runnymede*, under the circumstances detailed in the evidence given before a coroner's inquest.

Fenton Kennar said: I am a private soldier, late of the 56th Regiment of Foot, and doing duty as guard on board the hired convict-ship, *Runnymede*. Yesterday, about 3 o'clock in the afternoon, I was sitting against the water-barrel, on the main-deck, and heard Sergeant Robinson call out for Corporal Neven. Neven came on the quarter-deck, and the deceased told him to bring that man up for parade, referring to a man named Sullivan. Neven then

crossed the quarter-deck to the gangway, and called for Sullivan. In about a minute after Sullivan came on the quarter-deck and held up his firelock in both hands, and then went up the ladder, saying something I did not hear, in reply to something the sergeant said. Sullivan then went up to the sergeant, who took the firelock out of his hand, and was in the act of examining it. Corporal Neven walked up the ladder after Sullivan, with the musket in his hand. When he got to the head of the ladder he took a step out and stooped his body on one side. I heard the report of a gun, and saw the smoke about Sergeant Robinson. I heard Robinson exclaim, "O my God, I am shot." He then fell to the deck, and said, "O my God, I'm dead." With that I ran across the quarter-deck and seized Neven as he came to the foot of the ladder by the neck and arm. He said, "Kennar, let me go. Don't take such a hold of me. I have done it, but I have been driven to it." He was about four yards from Robinson when he fired. I have known deceased and Neven about six months. I have been doing duty with them as guard at Dartmoor Prison. There has been a bad feeling between them. I was on parade on Dartmoor about five months ago, and Neven fell in next to me. Sergeant Robinson found fault with him for being late, and told him he was dirty, and had not his appointments in proper order, and desired him not to come like that again. I and Neven were then doing duty as private soldiers. Robinson told him he was more like a militiaman coming on parade than a soldier. Neven said something which I did not hear, but

about five minutes after, on his return to the barrack-room, he said, "The next time he (referring to Robinson) finds fault with me, I'll put a ball into my piece and blow it through him." I have not heard Neven use any threats since. I reported Neven's words to Staff Sergeant Major Wood and to the deceased, about a week or a fortnight after. Neven was present when I reported him. He denied that he had said so, and the matter dropped. Since I have been on board (from last Wednesday) I have heard Neven grumble several times that he had been "put about" the vessel, but did not complain of Robinson. I heard from the corporal of the guard on Dartmoor that Neven had fits when on duty. He still kept on his duty. I have never missed him. I heard Neven tell Sullivan to bring his firelock up. I never heard he had been in Dartmoor Hospital for fits or anything else.

The prisoner said the musket he held had been loaded seven or eight days, and that when he came on the poop it went off. He did not know whether it was his musket or any one else's that had gone off. It hitched in the poultry coop.

Daniel Sullivan, another private of the regiment, confirmed these particulars; and Matthew Coomer, of the same regiment, who also witnessed the murder, stated that Neven held the musket in his two hands, and took aim at the time the gun went off; and said he was satisfied, from the appearance of Neven, and from the manner in which he held the musket, that he fired it intentionally.

Mr. Kay, assistant-surgeon to H.M.S. *Conqueror*, said that when

he went on board the *Runnymede*, he found the sergeant quite dead. He had lost two joints of the right ring-finger, and there was a musket-shot in the abdomen, through which the viscera protruded.

Various corroborative evidence was given, and Major Russell spoke to the ill-feeling which had subsisted between the two men.

The jury returned a verdict of "Wilful Murder."

The prisoner was then committed under the coroner's warrant to take his trial at the next assizes.

On the 30th July the prisoner was tried at Bodmin. He was defended by Mr. Coleridge, who endeavoured to show that, in all probability, the gun had gone off accidentally, and that there was no motive for the commission of the crime. The jury, however, found a verdict of "Guilty," in which the Judge said he fully concurred. Mr. Baron Martin passed sentence of death, which was carried into effect on the 11th of August. The prisoner confessed his crime.

2. THE WELLINGTON COLLEGE.—Soon after the death of the illustrious Duke a proposition was made that besides every national token of veneration and respect the people should testify their individual sense of his transcendent merits, by raising by private subscription a testimonial which should bear his name. A very considerable sum—upwards of 109,000*l.*—was quickly subscribed; and it was resolved that the testimonial should assume the shape of an endowed institution for the maintenance and education of orphans of officers of the Queen's and the East India Company's service. The ground selected for its site is an elevated spot six miles

from Farnborough, near Aldershott Camp and Sandhurst College, and within view of the domain presented by the nation as the perpetual inheritance of the Dukes of Wellington. The ceremony of laying the foundation-stone of the edifice was this day performed by Her Majesty. The sight presented by the locality of the future building was extremely imposing. A vast forest of scaffold-poles spread innumerable banners to the breeze; pavilions, gay with pennons, studied the ground, and a great assemblage of gentry occupied an amphitheatre of seats. Around all were assembled a small army of 14,000 men from the camp at Aldershott. Her Majesty, who was accompanied by Prince Albert and their children, and by various members of the Royal Family, had for guests H.R.H. Prince Frederick William of Prussia, whom fame now reported to be the affianced husband of the Princess Royal, and the Prince Regent of Baden. H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge waited on Her Majesty, with a large cluster of the nobility. Her Majesty was received on alighting by the Earl of Derby, one of the Vice-Presidents of the institution, and was by him conducted to the spot where the foundation-stone was slung. The noble Earl presented to Her Majesty an address appropriate to the occasion; to which Her Majesty read a suitable reply. The ceremony of laying the foundation-stone was then performed. After partaking of luncheon, Her Majesty viewed a splendid military spectacle. The whole force on the ground marched past and took up a position on the rising ground, and went through the manœuvres proper to the reception and repulse

of a formidable though invisible enemy. The force then divided itself into two opposing armies, and fought a sham fight with great spirit. The Duke of Cambridge commanded the troops during these manœuvres.

10. ASCOT RACES.—The aristocratic glories of Ascot have been much dimmed by the facilities of the railway, by which the splendid equipages of former days have been superseded. This falling off is compensated to some extent by the increase of visitors; and the attendance on the Cup day, when Her Majesty honoured the course with her presence, was almost unprecedented.

Of the principal races, the Queen's Vase was won by Mr. Parr's "Fisherman;" the Royal Hunt Cup, by Mr. Murland's "Forbidden Fruit;" the Gold Cup, by Mr. Walker's "Winkfield."

14. BAPTISM OF THE IMPERIAL PRINCE OF FRANCE.—The baptism of the Imperial Prince took place at the Cathedral of Nôtre Dame, in the presence of the Great Officers of State, the Corps Diplomatique, several Princes of the Imperial House, the Mayors of the capitals of all the departments, &c. &c. The arrangements were on a scale of great magnificence. The old building was gorgeously decorated for the occasion; in a centre of the transept stood an altar, a throne for the Cardinal Legate *a latere*, who presided at the ceremony, and seats of various elevation. The rites followed the usual course. The Grand Duchess of Baden acted as sponsor for the Queen of Sweden. At the conclusion of the ceremony the Empress took the Imperial child in her arms and kissed him. The Emperor then left his chair,

and taking his son and heir from the Empress, presented him to the assembly. A loud cry of *Vive l'Empereur*, immediately arose. The Pope sent valuable presents, amongst which was a rose of peculiar virtue, which Cardinal Patrizzi presented to the Empress in a Latin speech. Numerous festivities were held in commemoration of the event, and Paris was splendidly illuminated.

16. SUPPOSED MURDER OF A LADY AT ILKLEY.—Mr. M'Knight, a gentleman of considerable property in Dumfriesshire, had been staying some time at the Ben Rhydding hydropathic establishment, near Ilkley, accompanied by his wife, a lady of about 45 years of age. About 10 o'clock in the morning, she left Ben Rhydding alone to make some purchases at Ilkley. About 12 o'clock she left that village to return to Ben Rhydding. Nothing was, however, seen or heard of her till between 4 and 5 o'clock in the afternoon, when she was discovered lying at the foot of a ravine some 20 yards from the road. She was lying on her side with her arms on her chest and stomach, her legs crossed, and quite dead. Her dress was not at all disordered, and it was at first supposed that she had died naturally from disease of the heart. The absence of her purse and handkerchief, however, awoke suspicion, and a closer examination showed a mark on her knee as if she had fallen upon it; marks, as of strangulation, on her neck; a mark of violence above the left eye, which was blood shot; appearances on the wrists of having been tightly grasped. Besides these, the veil which was over the face was covered with blood and froth, and the top of the bonnet

was indented as with a blow. A *post-mortem* examination of the body, as given in evidence before the Coroner, proved that the heart, brain, and all the organs, were healthy, but the vessels at the apex of the brain were congested, and the jury, in accordance with medical evidence, returned a verdict that the deceased had died of congestion of the brain. It was generally believed, however, that if she had died from that cause the congestion was the result of strangulation. Government offered a reward of 100*l.*, and shortly after the inquest, suspicion fell on George Holmes, a man of bad repute, and already in custody on charge of assaulting and robbing a girl near the same place. It was then discovered that this man had been convicted and sentenced to transportation; but that having obtained a certificate of bad health, he had received from the Home Secretary a ticket-of-leave, a mercy of which he had availed himself to commence a new and active course of crime.

18. DISPLAY OF THE GREAT FOUNTAINS AT THE CRYSTAL PALACE.—The great fountains and the entire system of waterworks, designed by Sir Joseph Paxton, for the Crystal Palace at Sydenham, were for the first time brought into complete operation, in the presence of Her Majesty, and a concourse of about 20,000 persons. The day was singularly auspicious, and nothing could exceed the animation and variety of the scene in the grounds. At a little after 5 o'clock, the whole system of waterworks—the fountains on the terraces, the water temples, the cascades, the two large waterfalls, and the fountains in the grand lower basins, were brought gra-

dually into play. The effect was exceedingly fine. The large fountains in the lower basin and the circular one situated on the plateau, depend solely upon the water for their effect, and not at all, as is the case with the smaller fountains on the terraces, upon architecture or sculpture. The waters are made to shoot into the air in innumerable devices of great beauty. Around the circular basin, and in some parts of the larger ones, it becomes a liquid hedge, or plays in a network of jets; while in the centre, and almost over the whole surface of each of the basins, it throws up sparkling showers in all shapes, to various heights, breaking into misty spray at an immense elevation. An idea of the magnitude of this magnificent series of fountains and their combined effect—far excelling in some respects those of Versailles—may be given by the fact, that, when they are in full operation, there are 11,788 jets playing, and the quantity of water displayed simultaneously from them is about 120,000 gallons per minute. The system of waterworks includes the supply of water for ordinary purposes and for provision against fire in the Palace. The water for supplying the fountains is maintained at three different elevations—first, in the two high tower tanks, which supply the 250 feet jets in the centres of the lower great basins; secondly, in two lower tanks, which contain water for the fountains and ordinary use within the building, and supply also the high central jets in the upper series, and the secondary jets round each 250 feet jet in the lower grand basins; and thirdly, in the large upper reservoir at the northern end, which contains about 6,500,000 gallons,

and from which the great body of the water which is displayed in the fountains is drawn. Two 30-horse power pumping engines are used for raising water into the different tanks. Two reservoirs, one of which is in the form of an ornamental lake, receive the waste water from the fountains when in operation. The water displayed in the upper terrace fountains is conveyed through pipes to the large circular basin, where it plays a second time in the low network jets round the margin and in the low jets through the basin. Again, when the lower great fountains are displayed, all the waste water from the circular basin is similarly conveyed to them to play their jets of low elevation. Thus the water from the terrace fountains is displayed therein, and that from the circular basin twice in each grand display. When the display is over, the water is again pumped up into the higher tanks ready for the next occasions.

19. TRIAL OF A DESPERATE PIRATE.—William Lewis, 25, a tall, determined-looking man, was indicted at the Central Criminal Court, for feloniously attempting to induce a seaman to revolt and piratically to take possession of a ship and the goods and property contained therein. The indictment against the prisoner was framed under an old Act of Parliament of the 11th and 12th Wm. III., by the 9th section of which, it was enacted that any person who should endeavour to induce the commander or any seaman employed on board a vessel to desert his trust, and endeavour to take possession of the vessel, or to turn pirate or rebel, should be deemed guilty of felony, and suffer death upon conviction of the offence. The capital punishment had been lately removed by

the humanity of the Legislature. The ferocious proposal of the prisoner for the capture of the ship, with all its details of blood and massacre, were minutely related by one of the seamen; and it is right to add, that his statement was confirmed in all particulars by others of the crew to whom the pirate imparted his diabolical designs.

Walter Bolitho:—I was a seaman on board the *Stebonheath*. I joined the vessel at Melbourne. She was an English ship, and belonged to the port of London. The prisoner was also a seaman on board. He also joined at Melbourne. I had never seen him until that time. He came on board in the beginning of February in the present year, and the ship sailed on the 17th. The crew consisted of 32 persons, and there were about 25 passengers, some of whom were women. It was said there were two tons and a half of gold on board. On the 18th I was at the wheel, and the prisoner came on the poop to do some work, and he asked me how I should like "this here," meaning, I suppose, to be master of the vessel. He said nothing more then. The next day he spoke to me again, and asked if I had ever been on the coast of Peru. I told him I had not. Witness added that the prisoner gave him several details of acts of piracy and murder which he had previously committed; and continued:—the prisoner then asked me how I should like to be at that game, and I said it would do very well if I could always get clear. He then asked me if I would go, and he said the vessel would be a fine prize, as she had two tons and a half of gold, and I should have a share. I said I should like it very well, but it

would never come to pass. He said it could be done very easy, and if I would stick to him they would have her in eight-and-forty hours, and he had come on board on purpose. I told him I did not think it could be done, and he replied, "Who is there here that we care about? There is none here but a lot of old fellows who ought to have been out of the world long ago." He then said there was not a man who was on the fore-castle who would refuse a glass of grog, and he would give them a dose, and keep them quiet. He then proposed that the men on the look-out should be thrown overboard, and the first mate and the other officers were to be called forward and thrown overboard. He asked me if I was afraid to take a life, and he said there was no one to care about but the boatswain and carpenter, and a small bit of steel would settle them. I told him I had never yet taken a life, and he said he would not ask me to do that, he would do all that himself. He next asked me if there was any one else on board who would be likely to assist, and I picked on a man named Whittington, because it was his next look-out. The prisoner then said that after the captain and mate were out of the way they would go aft and haul up the ladder, and lay it across the hatch, so that no one could come up from below. The arm chest was then to be secured, and the passengers were to be told that the ship was in the hands of the crew. The captain and the mate were both to be got out of the way by shooting them, and the prisoner said he should have twelve shots left after they were shot. I asked him if he would kill the women too, and he replied, "Only the old

ones; we will keep the young ones till we get on the coast of Peru; and when we have got the gold out we will scuttle the ship, and let the women go down in her." He then said that they should go to the Salt Lake, and get on board the steamer for Panama, and it was only a bold stroke and the vessel was theirs. During this conversation the prisoner gave me brandy twice, from a keg he had with him in the fore-castle. Four bells then struck, and Whittington came to relieve me. The prisoner addressed him and said, "We shall be a fine prize for the Russians, Tom—would you not like to have a share?" He then gave him some brandy, and when he drank it made him sick. The prisoner then said there was a way for us to get the gold, and if they were honest to him he would sign the contract with his heart's blood. He then said, "What do you say to that? Will you join?" The prisoner then said that if the captain and mate were out of the way he would have charge of the ship in two minutes. The prisoner then repeated to Whittington what he had said to me about giving the sailors a dose that would keep them quiet; and Whittington asked me what I thought of it, and I said I did not think it could be managed. He then asked Whittington if there was any one on board he thought he could depend on, and he said, "Not one." The prisoner then said that half-a-dozen men would be sufficient, and the ship should never carry him round the Horn or to London, and he added, that he should load his revolvers, and he should not unload them until they had done execution; and he at the same time said to Whittington, "You need not be afraid of a pistol,

having been in the Ballarat riots." Whittington told him he was no more frightened of a pistol than he was, and he said he knew that, and this was why he put it to him. He then repeated to Whittington what he had told him about taking the gold and scuttling the ship. On the following morning I and Whittington were on the deck together, and we conversed upon what the prisoner had said, and when we were off the watch I saw the prisoner down below, and he beckoned to me, and I went to his bunk, and he took out two six-barrel revolvers, and asked me what I thought of them. He then took out two single barrel pistols and two daggers. In reply to the prisoner's question I said I thought they were stunners, and I saw he was well prepared. The prisoner replied, "By God! they never deceived me yet, and they are not going to it neither—I am a dead shot with either of the pistols." He showed me how the pistols worked, and said he could discharge every barrel as quickly as he could work his fingers. The prisoner then loaded both the revolvers, and put them into the bunk, where he slept, in a bag. The prisoner also showed me some bottles, and I asked him what was in them, and he said "You can judge." The bottles contained some liquid. On the same day one of the crew went to the boatswain for some spun-yarn, and the boatswain told him to be careful of it, as they must soon begin to make some. The prisoner then said to me, "Do you hear that—if he lives to see any spun-yarn made I am deceived." The next day after this, as I was coming from the wheel, the prisoner told me he was frightened that Whittington would have

nothing to do with it, but he would get his revolver, and then he did not care whether he joined or not. He then proposed that we should talk it over in the next watch, and he said he would settle Whittington, and asked me if I did not think he and I could not manage it. I told him I did not, and he then said he would go and secure another seaman who went by the name of Jonathan, and he went away as he said for that purpose, and when he returned he said, "It is all right, he is staunch, and I don't care whether Whittington joins or not." He then said to me, "What do you think of to-morrow night? We are far enough to the southward; she is just under the canvas I want, and will do till we get to the coast of Peru; there cannot be a better time, as they are all now sick in the cabin." He then said, "If I can depend upon you, we will have it to-morrow night." I told him I did not "funk" any, and he said he would get everything ready. He told me at the same time that when he was at the diggings he had stood before four armed men with his revolver, and had made them deliver up all they had got, and they were glad to get away with their lives. I then again asked him what he had in the bottles, and he said it was laudanum and some other stuff I forget the name of; and he said he would put it in the brandy, and it would make all hands quiet enough. He also said that he was going to have a birthday with the brandy, and he intended to give some of the crew an extra dose in order to make sure of them. On the following day I was on the look-out on the fore-castle from 6 to 8 in the evening, and the prisoner came up to me

and said, "Well, my chief officer, what do you think of it now?" I replied, "As much as ever I did." He then asked me what I thought of doing it that night, and I replied that I thought he had better leave it alone altogether. He then said that he would as soon go down and shoot himself as not, and he added that it was Whittington who had been persuading me off it. I told him I did not want any persuasion for that. He then said that all he was sorry for was that he had ever spoken to a soul on board, and that if he could depend on Whittington and me, the ship should be in his hands before Saturday morning at 5 o'clock, or else he would be a corpse in the cabin. The next morning I made a disclosure to the captain and mate of what had taken place. Whittington had seen the captain before, and we were both called in together to the captain's cabin.

Mr. John Serjeant, the captain of the *Stebonheath*, deposed that she was a vessel of 1014 tons burden. The crew consisted of 36 persons, and there were about 22 passengers on board, eight of whom were women. There was a large quantity of gold on board, about 61,000 oz., the value of which would be between 240,000*l.* and 250,000*l.* The prisoner, Bolitho, Kemp, and Whittington were all shipped at Melbourne, and they were entire strangers to him up to that time. On the 22nd of February, in consequence of a communication that was made to him by the chief mate, he sent for Bolitho and Whittington, and after hearing their statements he directed that the prisoner should be secured, and he was brought to England in custody upon the present charge.

Inspector White, of the Thames police, then produced the articles that were found in the prisoner's berth. They consisted of two six-barrel Colt's revolvers, the whole of the barrels being loaded, and some containing a double charge; two single-barrel pistols, also loaded; two Bowie knives, a flask full of gunpowder, a bag full of bullets, between 60 and 70 bullets loose, several boxes of percussion caps, and a bottle full of laudanum.

Inspector Shand, of the Thames police, proved that when he had charge of the prisoner at Gravesend, he said, "Well they have done it for me, but Whittington ought to be in my place. I suppose I shall have it for life, and it's no use saying anything about it."

Mr. Giffard, who defended the prisoner, said he should not attempt to deny that a most horrible conspiracy was attempted to be carried out on board the ship, involving a scheme of plunder certainly, and in all probability murder; but the question which, upon his instructions, he had to put to the jury was, whether it was not more probable upon the facts that the men who had given evidence against the prisoner were the really guilty parties, and that they now endeavoured to make him the scapegoat. He then commented upon the improbability of the story told by the witnesses, and their extraordinary statement that he had at once broached such a horrible proposition to persons to whom he was a perfect stranger.

The jury found the prisoner guilty, and Mr. Justice Coleridge, who said he quite concurred in the verdict, sentenced him to transportation for life.

19. MURDERS NEAR MELTON MOWBRAY.—Early in the morning
VOL. XCVIII.

Edward Woodcock, the keeper of the Thorpe toll-gate, a mile out of Melton on the Grantham road, an old man of seventy, and his grandson, a boy of ten years old, were discovered to have been murdered in their dwelling. The former lay weltering in his blood on the floor, with his throat cut, a bullet-wound through his body, and at least a dozen stabs; the child lay in bed with his head half-severed, and his body also cruelly gashed. An inquest was immediately held, and suspicion at once rested on a returned convict named Brown, living in a neighbouring village. Efforts were immediately made to effect his capture; and during the interval, other evidence arose to implicate him in the crime. On Sunday, the 22nd, he was taken at Weatherby, near York.

On the following Thursday he was examined before the magistrates at Melton. The prisoner displayed considerable acuteness in questioning the different witnesses. The following evidence was produced.

John Clayton, constable, of Thorpe, deposed that on the morning of the 19th instant, about half-past four, he was called and told to get up directly, as the toll-gate-keeper lay dead in his house. He got up directly, and went to the gate, which was about a quarter of a mile from his house. He found the door partly open, and saw the body of Edward Woodcock lying dead on the floor, with several severe cuts upon it. Saw on his shirt the marks of burning, as if from powder, and afterwards found a pistol-ball on the floor. In the adjoining room he saw the body of a little boy, James Woodcock. He was lying on his belly on the bed, and had two stabs about his loins.

On raising his head he discerned that his throat was cut. The boy would have been ten years old the day after the occurrence. The boy did not live with the old man, but always went at night to sleep with him for company. He afterwards found a pistol lying on the floor, close to the body of the old man, and covered with blood. He also found a tobacco-stopper. Gave the tobacco-stopper and pistol to Superintendent Condon. Believed the pistol and tobacco-stopper now produced to be the same which he gave him.

Alfred Routen deposed that he was a baker, residing at Ashfordby. Early last Thursday morning he left Ashfordby for Grantham, and had to pass through the Thorpe toll-gate, where he arrived at twenty-minutes before four. He shouted "Gate" twice, but no one answered. Thereupon got out of the cart, and on looking into the house, the door of which was partly open, he saw the body of a man lying dead on the floor in a pool of blood. Witness gave information to the police.

Police Superintendent Condon deposed that on the morning of Thursday, about five o'clock, he went to the Thorpe toll-gate, in consequence of information he had received, and found Edward Woodcock lying dead on the floor in a pool of blood. Observed also the body of a boy dead on a bed in the adjoining room. He did not then know the boy. Received the pistol and tobacco-stopper, which he now produced, from the witness Clayton. Afterwards heard that a man had been seen the night before in a hovel belonging to W. Moore, and traced footsteps thence in the direction of the toll-gate, a distance of about 300

yards. The track crossed two fields, one pasture and the other mowing-grass. The field in which the hovel is situated is mowing-grass. The track appeared quite fresh. In the hovel was a heap of stubble, in which he observed the traces of a man having lain there. He suspected the prisoner, and went immediately to Scalford and other places in search for him. Showed the tobacco-stopper to a person named John Cook, a watch-maker, at Nottingham, who said he had seen it in the possession of Brown. Showed the pistol to a man named Asher, and to another man named Moulding, both of Leicester. Received the bullet produced from W. Barwis, the surgeon.

William Asher, of 40, Bedford Street, Leicester, deposed that he was a coal-higgler. Three doors from him there lived a man named John Brown, brother to the prisoner. Saw the prisoner at his brother's house on the 11th instant. Saw a pistol in the prisoner's hand on that night, when he was standing before his brother's house. He held it up, and said to the neighbours he had got it to protect the woman he had with him (his brother's wife) on the road, and might God strike him dead if he would not blow out the brains of the first man who touched her. He called the woman his sister. This was after he had run away with his brother's wife. Could not swear to the pistol now produced, although it was like that he saw in the prisoner's hand.

Mr. Moulding sworn Lived in White Lion Yard, Bedford Street, Leicester, and was a framework knitter. Knew the prisoner, whom he first saw three weeks ago against his brother's door. He had a newspaper in his hand. The next

time he saw him was on the 11th instant in his brother's house. Did not hear any words between him and his brother. He came out of the house into the street, when witness went to talk to him about running away with his brother's wife. He said he did not run away with her, but went with her on the road to protect her, and if anybody had molested her or offered to lay a finger on her, might God strike him dead if he would not blow his brains out. He then pulled out a pistol, capped and half-cocked, from his left-hand pocket. Believed the pistol now produced to be the same, but could not swear to it. Never saw a knife in the prisoner's possession.

John Carpendale: Is the occupier of two fields near the Thorpe toll-gate. Saw the prisoner on Tuesday, the 17th instant, in one of his fields, about six in the evening. He came off the turnpike into the field, came up to witness, but did not speak at first. Witness asked him what he wanted; to which he replied, he had come from London to see some acquaintances, and was now going to see some friends at Timber-hill, a back street in Melton. He said he should have been further on the road, but he had been stopping an hour or two with old Woodcock. He said, also, the old man had told him he had not a wife, and had not a housekeeper. Witness said he believed he had a little boy with him at nights. The prisoner remarked, "It is very lonely and very dangerous for the old man to be by himself." He added, that if he himself were keeping that bar, he would have a housekeeper if he had not a wife. He asked further if the old man went to bed, or sat up at nights, to

which witness replied he could not say. Prisoner walked with him from the field to the town, and made many remarks about the number of people on the road.

Henry Read and W. Moore identified the clothes found in a hedge-bottom at Scalford, as having been worn by the prisoner.

Francis O'Hare, fishmonger, deposed that on Wednesday night, being in a field of Mr. Moore's he heard a noise in a hovel in the field, and on going in he saw the prisoner sitting there in the act of pulling off his shoes. He did not before know the prisoner. On asking him what he did there, he said, "I am resting a bit." Witness said, "Then you mean taking your lodgings here for to-night," to which he replied, "No, I don't. I might do so if I was drunk, but I shan't to-night." Noticed his dress. Did not observe any track at that time on the grass, but thought if there had been one he should have seen it.

The prisoner then cross-examined this witness with extraordinary ability, to show that the track on the grass was made by the witness himself walking upon the grass, but the latter denied walking about at all. He also interrogated him as to his reasons for being alarmed at his appearance, to which he said he was unable to give a direct answer.

Ann Brown, the prisoner's paramour, who gave her evidence with great reluctance, identified the clothes found at Scalford to be those worn by the prisoner. She had, in fact, repaired and altered them for him.

Several other witnesses identified more or less completely the pistol and tobacco-stopper found in the gate-house as having been in

the prisoner's possession; and the chief constable stated that the prisoner admitted that he had slept in a hovel near Melton on the night of the murder. It appeared also that the prisoner, who was wretchedly poor, was found after the murder to be possessed of money to some amount, and other articles.

The prisoner was committed for trial. He was tried at Leicester on the 15th of July. The jury found him "Guilty," without any hesitation, and he was sentenced to death.

His execution took place on the 25th. He protested his innocence to the last. His father secured a seat at a public-house exactly opposite the drop, and sat there for some hours before the execution, regaling himself with beer and conversing with his friends. When his son appeared he recognised him by waving his handkerchief.

23. FATAL COLLIERY ACCIDENT IN SOUTH STAFFORDSHIRE. — A most deplorable accident occurred in the neighbourhood of Dudley, at the Old Park Colliery. On Friday morning the usual complement of men and lads descended the shaft (30 in number), and at 6 o'clock in the evening they were prepared to leave work. At that hour eight of the men and boys jumped into the skip, for the purpose of being drawn to the top of the shaft. They had arrived nearly at the surface, when the pit chain snapped asunder, and precipitated them to the bottom of the shaft, 46 yards in depth. The skip would seem to have descended the shaft in a perpendicular line, as no noise was heard by those at the bottom until it struck the ground. The poor fellows were then found in a crushed and mangled mass. Five out of the eight were already

lifeless, and the other three died within two hours after they were brought to the pit's mouth.

JULY.

6. FATAL STEAMBOAT COLLISION ON THE MERSEY. — A very disastrous accident occurred on the Mersey. The new iron steamer *Excelsior*, just built on the Clyde, was proceeding on her first voyage to Belfast, having left Liverpool soon after midnight. When off the lighthouse she came in direct collision with the Dublin Screw Company's iron screw steamer *Mail*, the stem of the *Excelsior* knocking off the figure-head of the *Mail*, entering her port bow near the bowsprit, and tearing its way through the spardeck as far as the foremast. In the forepart of the *Mail*, under the spardeck, lay a number of deck passengers, Irish labourers, who were coming to the harvest in England. They lay asleep, with their heads close up to the bows of the ship. Five were killed as they lay, nine others were dreadfully mangled, and three of them died shortly after. Fortunately, the bulkheads remained firm, and the *Mail*, though thus cut down to the water's edge, kept afloat, with the stem of the *Excelsior* so firmly imbedded in the wreck, that it took upwards of an hour to get her free. The scene under the spardeck was most heartrending. The mangled bodies of the dead Irishmen lay covered with blood, and the wounded were crying for help; some of them being jammed up against the windlass, and unable to extricate themselves. When the bodies were brought out they presented a most frightful spectacle. One man's

skull was literally stove in, and the protruding brains overlapped the face. Another man seemed to have all his bones broken; and a round tin box, which was in his waistcoat pocket, was crushed as flat as a crown-piece.

The inquest which followed was adjourned ten times. The result of the investigation was a verdict of Manslaughter against the pilot and mate of the *Excelsior*.

7. MUTINY OF THE TIPPERARY MILITIA.—A rather serious disturbance took place at Nenagh, owing to acts of disaffection among the Tipperary Militia. This body was on the point of being disbanded, and discontent arose among the men, because they had to give up their clothes, and did not receive a bounty, to which they thought they had a claim. The first outbreak was in consequence of a man belonging to No. 4 Company refusing to give up a pair of black trousers. He was sent to the guard-house; his companions immediately tried to rescue him. The guard was ordered to fire, but had no ammunition. The men, for a time, desisted; but the five companies quartered in Pound Street Barracks arrived shortly after at Summerhill Barracks, to be drilled. Hearing that the man was confined, they fixed bayonets, and marched into the guard-room, broke open with guns and stones all the cell doors; liberated all the prisoners, and demolished the windows, seats, and everything else that was destructible. They were brought into line at length, and addressed by the colonel, the major, and a parish priest. They became calmer, but still refused to give up their arms, unless they received the residue of their bounty, and were allowed to take their

clothes with them. In the evening, having returned to their barracks, they broke out of them at about ten o'clock, and proceeded to attack the police barracks and the magazine, from which, by a fortunate precaution, the ammunition had been removed. They continued marching about the streets till about twelve o'clock; firing volleys in the air at frequent intervals, and demolishing the windows of numerous houses. Next day 500 regular troops arrived, and marched into the barrack square, where they formed in line. The militia were ordered to lay down their arms, and again refused. In the meantime the militia-men, who were straggling about the town, collected, and commenced firing outside the barracks. One man fired through the wicket, and killed a soldier of the 41st Regiment. A part of the troops were sent to chase them away; but they hid in lanes and nooks, and fired on the soldiers as they passed. The firing of the militia continued till nine o'clock; but half an hour afterwards all was quiet, and the militia were prisoners. Three of the mutineers were killed, and a good many wounded, in the course of the disturbances.

The ringleaders in these shameful outrages were brought to trial. The man who shot the soldier was sentenced to death, but that doom was commuted to transportation for life; five men to 21 years; five to 15; and two to 12 years' transportation; or rather to the alternative periods of penal servitude.

10. BURGLARY AND VIOLENCE.—Edward Towers, aged 18, groom; Henry Horwood, 23, painter; and William Fleckhart, 37, engineer, were indicted at the Central Criminal Court, for a burglary in the

dwelling-house of Isabella Humphreys, and stealing 100 sovereigns, three 5*l.* Bank of England notes, three watches, and several articles of plate, her property; and the indictment charged the prisoners with having, at the time of the robbery, assaulted and beaten the prosecutrix and another person, named Eliza Cooke. John Peyton, a respectable-looking man, who surrendered to take his trial, was charged with receiving a silver watch, part of the property, knowing it to have been stolen.

The prosecutrix, Mrs. Humphreys, was a very aged lady, living at Stamford Hill; the only inmate of the house besides herself being a female servant. She was possessed of some considerable property, and had the imprudent habit of keeping large sums of money in the house in cash; and this fact would appear to have become known, and no doubt was the cause of the robbery. The circumstances of this barbarous robbery will best appear from the evidence.

Eliza Cooke said that she had been in the service of the prosecutrix for two years and a half. On the night of the 24th of April she closed the windows and doors as usual, and she and her mistress went to bed about ten o'clock. Soon after six o'clock on the following morning she got up and went down stairs, and observed that the parlour door was ajar, and upon her opening it two men rushed upon her, and one of them struck her on the side of the head and knocked her down, and she lost her senses for a moment. When she came to herself she heard her mistress scream, and lost her senses again, and when she recovered she found a man kneeling upon her side with a

knife in his hand, which he held to her throat in a threatening manner, and said, "Will you be quiet?" She said that she would if he would let her alone. Another man then came into the room, and they carried her into the kitchen, and the second man then asked her where the plate was. She said that all the plate she knew of was three silver spoons; and the man replied that they were only old things; and he then inquired where the money was kept. She told him she did not know, and he then held the knife to her throat, and said she might do which she liked, either tell them where the money was, or they would have her life. He also said that they had murdered her mistress, and that they would kill her if she did not tell them where the money was. In consequence of those threats she told them of all the money she knew of, and they took her up stairs into the front parlour, and she showed them where some money was in that room. The men then said something to each other which she did not understand, and one of them immediately produced a rope, and they tied her hands and feet, and one remained with her, and the others left the room and went up stairs, and one of them came down shortly afterwards, and said that the others wanted to take the old woman into the cellar, but he would not allow it. She was then left alone, and in about three-quarters of an hour she succeeded in working her arms free, and released herself. The men at this time had left, and she went up to her mistress's room, and found her with her hands tied, and a rope was passed round them under the bed clothes, a handkerchief was over her mouth, and two

pillows were placed over her face. She saw four men in the house altogether. One was disguised by a handkerchief over his face, another had his face covered with a piece of net or crape, and the third had a piece of linen for the same purpose. She had no opportunity of seeing the face of the fourth man, and was unable to say whether he was disguised or not. Upon examining the house she found a quantity of strange tools, and among them a piece of steel, which was produced. The brick-wall had been broken through over the wash-house, and a hole made large enough to admit the body of a man. The wife of the prisoner Horwood had formerly been in the service of Mrs. Humphreys, and was consequently well acquainted with her habits, and when she left witness succeeded her. About seven weeks before the robbery, a man, who the witness positively swore to be the prisoner Fleckhart, accompanied by a woman, came to the house of the prosecutrix, and represented that Mr. Rush, the legal adviser of Mrs. Humphreys, was very ill, and wished that some one should be sent to him immediately, and wished her to go to him, but she declined to do so. While the prisoner Fleckhart was in the house, he represented that he was ill, and went into the back yard, and he had thus an opportunity of examining the premises.

The deposition of Mrs. Humphreys, who was in such a state of health, on account of her advanced age, and the shock her system had received in consequence of this violence, as to be unable to appear in court, was put in and read. She stated positively that Fleckhart was the man who came to her

house at the time mentioned by the witness Eliza Cooke, and made the false representation respecting Mr. Rush, her solicitor. She also said that on the morning of the robbery, shortly after her servant had gone down stairs, she heard a scream, and directly afterwards there was the sound of footsteps on the stairs, and two men came into her bedroom, and one seized her on one side, and the other on the other. Their faces were covered, and she said they looked like two black dogs jumping on the bed. She screamed, and the men pinched her nose and her mouth, and she could hardly breathe, and one of the men said they had killed her servant, and they would kill her, and asked for a knife. They then took a silver watch from her neck, and ransacked the drawers, and they tied her with a rope on the bed, and placed a handkerchief over her mouth, and then two pillows upon her face, and she was unable to breathe, and was nearly dead. The watch now produced was the one that was taken from her neck, and besides this she lost a great number of sovereigns, two gold watches, a silver teapot, and three 5*l.* Bank of England notes.

Several witnesses identified Fleckhart as having been seen near the house on the day of the robbery. Horwood was also in some degree recognised.

A man named George Smith, was then examined. He stated that the prisoner Horwood married his wife's sister, and Towers was his wife's brother. In January last he was at a public-house, and Horwood came there, accompanied by Fleckhart, and he introduced Fleckhart to him, and said that his friend "Bill," meaning Fleckhart, was the man to do

Mrs. Humphreys' job; that he could make tools, and was not afraid to use them. He shook his head at Horwood to intimate that he ought not to talk in such a manner, and nothing more took place at this time. After the proceeding that took place in February at Mrs. Humphreys' house, he saw the prisoner Towers, and told him that he understood an attempt had been made to rob Mrs. Humphreys, and he said that he and Horwood, and Annie Perkins and Fleckhart, had gone to the house, and that he and Horwood remained outside while the other two went in, and when they came out they said that they could not do anything, and that Mrs. Humphreys had behaved so well to them that the man had not the heart to rob her. They said at the same time that when Annie's brother Slark came home the robbery should be effected; and they said that he was a very determined man, and that he would get into the house if he went down the chimney or broke through the wall, or pulled the slates off the roof to do it. After the robbery had been committed, he saw Horwood and Towers together, and conversed with them upon the subject, and they said it had been done by Annie's brother and some of his pals, and they added that what was stolen was far enough off in the country by that time. The wife of the prisoner Horwood was present when this conversation took place, and she said that she wished her tongue had been cut out before she had said anything about it.

The case against the prisoner Peyton was, that he was warder on board the *Stirling Castle*, convict ship, and had charge of the man Slark; after which the watch of

the prosecutrix had been found in his possession. The Crown, however, failed to prove any criminal charge, and, in fact, the accused was proved to be a very respectable person.

The jury found a verdict of Guilty against Fleckhart, and Acquitted the other prisoners.

The learned Judge, in ordering sentence of death to be recorded, said he hardly recollected a more aggravated burglary than the one of which the prisoner had been convicted; and the only circumstance in his favour was, that no actual violence had been inflicted upon any of the inmates of the house. He should, on this account, recommend that his life should be spared, and that recommendation would, no doubt, be attended to; but he must expect to be sent out of the country for the remainder of his life.

15. TRIAL FOR MANSLAUGHTER.—BARBAROUS CRUELTY.—Samuel Barratt, aged 65, Susannah Barratt, his wife, aged 64, and Elizabeth Barratt, their daughter, aged 33, were indicted at Bedford for the manslaughter of Helen Barratt, aged 18, on the 30th of March last.

It appeared that the male prisoner is a shepherd living at Apsley Guise, in a well-to-do cottage, neatly kept, well-furnished, and presenting no external signs of poverty. He had a family of six daughters and one boy, the latter, a child, being employed in keeping crows—two of the former were married. The eldest daughter was the prisoner Elizabeth, who lived at home, and of late would seem to have given up work, contenting herself with managing the house and attending to the younger family. On Sunday, the 30th of

March, Helen Barratt died, and, suspicion having been excited that she had come to her death unfairly, an inquest was held upon her body, which presented all the appearances of that of a child of eleven only, though she was nearly eighteen. She was of diminutive stature, and, when opened, her bowels were found to be distended with air. As for her stomach, it could hardly be discovered, being as small as that of a child of only five years of age : when opened, it was found to contain under an ounce weight of thin barley gruel. The prisoners were examined before the coroner, as was a younger sister of the deceased, who deposed that the children had all as much as they wanted, and were carefully attended by the prisoners. The jury, however, returned a verdict of manslaughter against the parents, and in support of that charge and of the indictment now preferred against them in conjunction with their daughter, Charlotte and Julia Barratt, two little things respectively aged 16 and 14, though they looked hardly half those ages, were examined. According to their account, they and the deceased had been compelled by their mother and sister Elizabeth for the last fifteen or sixteen months to work fourteen hours a day at the lace pillow. During the whole of that time they were scantily fed on barley or oatmeal gruel for breakfast and dinner, with a piece of scalded bread about as big as the palms of their own pigmy hands for supper, and even that was denied to them if they did not accomplish their allotted tale of five feet of lace in the day. When they fell short they were sent off supperless, and were, moreover, whipped as a sub-

stitute for their supper, while on the following morning they were compelled to rise betimes to make up lost time, and work before breakfast half naked. Their workplace was the front-room, in which they had no fire, and if they sought to warm their attenuated forms and fingers in the back room, where their cruel parent and sister sat and enjoyed themselves, they would be driven forth to resume their weary task, and cursed as "idle things." If they failed to work enough, or otherwise offended these monsters, the two girls both swore that they and the deceased were flogged with the thistles and nettles, and sometimes the excrement of sheep, cows, and rabbits was forced down their throats by way of punishment. Under this treatment all the three poor creatures pined and wasted almost to skeletons, and Helen rapidly sank. She had repeated fainting fits, and at last, on the 29th of March, her weary fingers refused to work, and, contracting, incapacitated her from doing anything. On that night she was sent supperless to bed, and so also on the next, though she prayed for food. Instead of food, however, her mother flogged her with her stays on her bare person, and told her to go to bed, for "that was supper enough for her." In the night she cried for food, but her heartless mother, getting up, "cuffed her," and told her to lie quiet. After that she was heard to sing a hymn, and to pray, ending her appeal to God with "O, Lord Jesus! help me to do my work next week." At five her brother got up and went to work, and it was then discovered that the prayer of the supplicant had been heard—she lay dead in

her bed. Immediately after the inquest the sisters Charlotte and Julia were removed to the work-house, and there found to weigh respectively only 46½lb. and 39lb., whereas after three weeks of care and proper nourishment, they weighed 64½lb. and 54lb. respectively, and were now quite well, though still remarkably small in stature. As soon as the inquest was over, the prisoner Elizabeth employed a neighbour to remove the furniture from Apsley to Crawley, to the house of a brother, and on that occasion she was shown to be in possession of plenty of gold and silver, as well as valuables in the shape of furniture and wearing apparel; so that it was abundantly clear that she and her parents had ample means at command.

When called upon for his defence, the father said he was a hard-working man, and had given all his earnings to his wife, and knew nothing of the ill-treatment of his children; while his wife and daughter accused the children of idleness and untruthfulness.

Mr. Justice Coleridge, in summing up the evidence, told the jury that if the father gave the funds to his wife which were requisite for his family he would be entitled to an acquittal, for the responsibility, which the law cast on him primarily, would rest with his wife. If he did his duty and did not participate in the almost incredible cruelty practised by his wife and daughter, according to the witnesses, he was not guilty; but the jury would say whether they would make any distinction in his favour.

The jury found all the prisoners Guilty, but recommended the father to mercy.

He was sentenced to twelve

months' imprisonment. The two women each to two years' penal servitude.

15. ACCIDENT AT THE CYMMER COLLIERY NEAR PONTYPRIDD—114 LIVES LOST.—A fearful accident occurred at the Cymmer Works, in the Rhondda Valley, Glamorgan-shire. The loss of life was frightful; out of 130 persons, who were at work in the pit, 114 perished. The explosion which caused this terrible destruction of human life was apparently very slight, the interior of the works being very little damaged. The explosion of the fire-damp occurred near the entrance to the works, and thus exposed to the after or choke-damp (the suffocating properties of which are too well known) the great body of workmen who were in its rear. The position in which the corpses were found showed that, upon finding the air cut off from them, the affrighted workmen ran from their stalls to mingle and die together. At one spot 20 bodies were found, and at another 13, all lying huddled upon each other. In one stall an aged father and three of his sons were found lying side by side. The appearance of the men who had been burnt was very shocking, but those who had been suffocated merely appeared as if in a deep sleep.

The aspect of the country on the days when the corpses were interred was woeful beyond description. All the colliers and their families came out from the distant mines, and accompanied the funeral processions in long trains; thus the valley was seen intersected by long lines of mourners accompanying the corpses to distant graveyards, the women singing hymns and dirges. The men, on the other hand, were

gloomy and irritative, and disturbances were apprehended.

An exceedingly protracted investigation ensued, in the course of which it transpired that from want of clearness in the superintending department of the colliery, the benevolent intentions of the Act of Parliament were completely frustrated. The man upon whom, legally, the responsibility rested, declared that his duties were entirely above ground; and those who were immediately concerned with the state of things below did their duties in a most inefficient way. There were no safety lamps. The colliery was worked throughout with naked candles. In almost all the headings gas had been occasionally seen. In one it was a frequent occurrence for there to be "caps" (ignited globules of gas) at the end of the candles, half an inch high. The ordinary indication that a heading might be safely worked had formerly been *to leave a lighted candle* burning in it. When there was danger, cross pieces of wood were put up at the entrance to show there was fire there. In November last these signals were abolished and certain tin-tickets substituted, which the colliers were instructed to hang on a nail at the entrance of the stall or heading, leaving them to be removed by the firemen next morning. This precaution was utterly neglected—indeed, one man put his ticket in his pocket, lost it the first day, and never had another supplied to him. This plan, therefore, had to be given up, and the safety signal for the future consisted of a pick-axe, placed in a peculiar way by the firemen at the entrance of the heading. A set of rules were drawn up in Welsh and English, the first of which was that

the manager should make the men acquainted with them. One man declared they had never been read to him;—and in contravention of one of them, which forbade any one to go into any other part of the mine than where he worked, he and another man had, on the morning of the explosion, gone to an old working, known as David Arthur's dip, to bring up some iron tram-plates. They were sitting down by the dip-door when the roar of the exploding gas was heard, and he had hardly time to fling himself on his face before the current of gas and fire rushed over him, and he remembered nothing more till, some hours after, burnt and mutilated, he awoke to consciousness at the pit's mouth.

17. FRIGHTFUL RAILWAY ACCIDENT IN THE UNITED STATES. —One of the most horrible casualties ever recorded took place at the Camphill Station of the North Pennsylvania line, about fourteen miles from Philadelphia, on a portion of the line which curves twice, so that at a distance of 500 yards the approaching locomotives could not be seen by the respective engineers. It appears that 1100 children, of various ages, started from Philadelphia, with their teachers and friends, for a picnic on grounds near the North Pennsylvania Railway. There was but one track, and the train, being unusually heavy, was detained beyond its time. The regular down-passenger-train, instead of waiting at the turn-out, pushed on at full speed, and in rounding the curve the two trains came in collision. The two locomotives rose on end and were locked together in one undistinguishable mass. Three of the cars on the excursion train were ground to

splinters, and the unhappy children crushed beneath the ruins. The next two cars were thrust forward over the ruins, and into this mass of broken iron, splintered wood, and mangled limbs and bodies, fire from the locomotive fell, igniting the whole. Then ensued a scene too horrible for description. The dead were charred and burnt so as to be beyond the recognition of their friends. The agonies of the dying were made more excruciating by suffocating smoke and heat, while the wounded and mangled, pinned by the firm masses which covered them, met a slow death by fire. The total number of the victims by this wholesale slaughter was said to exceed 100. The guilty conductor, whose recklessness caused this destruction, put an end to his own life by arsenic.

The same journals record the burning of a steamer between Buffalo and Toledo, when thirty or forty persons perished.

17. TRIAL FOR MURDERING THE KEEPER OF A GAOL.—John Murdock, aged 20, was placed at the bar at the Lewes Assizes to take his trial for the wilful murder of James Welland.

The unfortunate deceased was the keeper of the gaol at Hastings, and on the 10th of March last the prisoner and a boy named Wright were in his custody upon a charge of picking pockets, they being the only two prisoners confined in the gaol, and the only other persons within the building being the deceased and his daughter-in-law, who acted as matron. It appeared that about seven o'clock in the morning the deceased was heard by his daughter-in-law to unlock the prisoners' sleeping cells. They followed him down stairs, and when

they got to the bottom part of the building the daughter heard a door suddenly slam to, and, upon looking out of the window, she saw the two prisoners running across the yard. She knew that something was wrong, and she called out "Police!" The prisoner Murdock then returned and fastened a door which prevented her getting into the yard, and after this he succeeded in clambering over the external wall of the gaol and made his escape. The boy Wright then returned and opened the door, and the daughter, upon going into the deceased's room, found him lying upon the ground quite dead. From the appearance of his eyes and the marks upon his throat, his death had evidently been caused by strangulation, and the suggestion on behalf of the Crown was, that as he was descending the stairs the prisoner had suddenly seized him by the throat from behind and had strangled him before he could offer any resistance. A man who had been confined in the gaol with the prisoner shortly before the transaction in question, named French, stated that one day Murdock told him he would show him how they might get out of prison, and that he suddenly seized him round the neck and lifted him off the ground and nearly strangled him, and he said he would go behind the old man and serve him in the same way and soon do for him, and then they could all three make their escape.

The defence was, that the prisoner never meant to do deceased any harm, but that the excitement of seeing him escape was too great for the old man, and that he died of apoplexy in consequence.

The jury found the prisoner Guilty of wilful murder, but

strongly recommended him to mercy, on the ground that they believed he had no intention to kill the deceased, but merely desired to make his escape from the prison.

Several cases of murder of the keepers and officers of gaols by prisoners having recently occurred, the Secretary of State directed the sentence to be carried into effect.

GREAT FIRE AT SHAD THAMES.—Between ten and eleven o'clock, P.M., a fire broke out in the premises known as the Shad Thames Flour Mills, situate at the side of Horselydown canal, and extending into Shad Thames.

The mill, which was fitted up with valuable steam-power, worked a number of large and powerful stones, and at the time of the occurrence the mill was in full work; when suddenly one of the men discovered that flames were raging with great vigour in the first-floor warehouse, in which a vast stock in trade was deposited.

The light of the conflagration speedily brought the brigade engines to the spot, and the steam floating engine came down the river. In spite of their utmost exertions, and the enormous volume of water they threw on the burning pile, the flames spread over the whole premises, and extended to some vessels lying in the river, and to some adjoining stores. The flames could not be subdued until a late hour of the following morning. The value of the premises, machinery, and stock in trade destroyed, has been estimated at 100,000*l*.

21. TRIAL FOR THE MURDER OF A HUSBAND.—Elizabeth Martha Brown was indicted at Dorchester for the wilful murder of John Anthony Brown, her husband, at Broadwindsor, on the 6th July.

It appeared by the statement of the counsel for the Crown that the prisoner and the deceased were formerly fellow-servants on a farm. An intimacy sprang up between them, and, although he was only nineteen and the prisoner forty, they were married about five years since. The deceased then became a carrier, and was, in consequence, frequently from home. There was reason to believe that the prisoner had become jealous of her husband. On the 5th of July the deceased went with his horse and cart with another man, also with a horse and cart, to Beaminster, a distance of about seven miles. On the road they saw Mary Davis, the woman of whom the prisoner was jealous, who walked some short way with them. They left Beaminster on their return home about four o'clock in the afternoon, but called at a public-house on their road, where they remained drinking and playing at skittles until midnight; they then left the public-house and proceeded onward until they came to a division of the road where the deceased and his friend parted, each going towards his own home. About two o'clock in the morning a woman named Knight, who lived close to the gate of the field in which the deceased kept his horse, heard footsteps, which she believed to be those of the deceased, going past her house. She had previously heard the gate of the field slam, and a noise as of a horse eating the grass. A Mrs. Frampton, who lived some distance off, heard screams between two and three o'clock in the morning, proceeding in a direction from Brown's house. All was then quiet until five o'clock in the morning, when the prisoner called up a person named Damon, who

lived some 130 yards off. He immediately went to Brown's house, and in an inner room found Brown lying on the floor on his right side; blood was flowing freely from his head, and his hair was covered with brains and blood. He was dead. The prisoner was standing by. He asked her how it happened. She said she had heard a noise outside the house, and she opened the door, and found her husband—he was bleeding very much. He said, "The horse." She carried him along the passage through the shop, and into this inner room. Damon asked her why she did not call him before. She said her husband had hold of her dress, and she could not get away from him until he became weak and faint, and then she pushed him back, and he fell on the ground. Damon examined the body, but there was no blood on the bosom of his shirt. There was no blood in the passage or in the house, except in the room where the body was lying. There was no blood in the road leading from the field, nor were there any marks of any struggle. The field gate was 137 yards from the house. His hat was close to the gate as if it had been placed there, and did not appear as if it had fallen off. A halter was hanging on the rail of the gate. The deceased's head was tied up with a handkerchief.

The evidence was entirely circumstantial, and depended mainly on the evidence given by the surgeon as to the nature of the injuries which had caused death. It appeared that the head of the deceased had been dreadfully knocked about; there were numerous wounds, by which the skull had been fractured in many places

and pieces of the bone driven into the skull; the face also was much lacerated; the nose was smashed in, and the left ear cut and the adjoining bone broken. All these injuries had been inflicted by some triangular instrument. The injuries were of such a nature that if the deceased did not die immediately he must have become insensible at the first blow. It was impossible that he could have walked from the field to the house, even with assistance. It was impossible that he could have been led or drawn from the field gate along the road and through the house without leaving traces of blood; nor could the prisoner have held or supported him as she stated without her clothes becoming covered with blood. The wounds were not such as could have been inflicted by the kicks of a horse; they were probably the result of repeated blows by the back of a hatchet, the triangular corners of the back being just such instruments as would produce wounds of this form.

After some hours' deliberation the jury found the prisoner Guilty, and she was sentenced to death. This sentence was carried out. The prisoner confessed her guilt.

26. THE BURNOFFIELD MURDER.—John Cain, aged 40, labourer, and Richard Rayne, aged 44, blacksmith, were charged, at the Durham Assizes, with the wilful murder of Robert Stirling, of Winlaton, on the 1st of November, 1855.

The particulars of this shocking crime were given in the CHRONICLE of last year, p. 168; but were reproduced on the trial with minuter details.

The deceased was a young Scotchman about 26 years of age, connected with the profession of me-

dicine. He had come over to England on the 20th of October preceding, only ten days before, as assistant to Mr. Watson, surgeon, but had previously endeavoured to obtain a post as surgeon to the Turkish Contingent, and he expected every day to hear of his appointment. On Thursday, the 1st of November, he went out to attend the patients of Mr. Watson, and in the course of his duties went to a place near Smales' Lane, called Spen. Before he went he borrowed from a pupil of Mr. Watson a watchguard, which he attached to his watch, and put round his neck. He went and saw several patients in the direction which he proposed to take when he left. He never came home. Immediately after Mr. Watson saw in a newspaper that Mr. Stirling was appointed to the post of surgeon to the Turkish Contingent, and thought that Mr. Stirling had gone off and joined his corps without taking leave. He considered it bad conduct, but only wrote to his friends in Scotland, that the young gentleman had gone off. The father was not satisfied with this statement, being convinced his son would never leave in such a way, and, accordingly, came over: a search was then made which led to the discovery of his corpse. On Tuesday, the 6th of November, Mr. Thompson, the assistant, and a woodman named Holmes, went to search about the place where the young man had last been seen. Eventually they found deceased in the wood, about 54 feet from the road. There was a gap in the hedge, and a good deal of underwood about. The body had evidently been drawn through the gap, and lay in a dell going down towards the river. At the time it

was found the head was up the bank, as if it had been pulled head-foremost, and deceased appeared to have been dragged along the road, the right hand grasping the ground, the left hand under him, his face bruised, his throat cut, his clothes torn, a wound in the belly as if from shot, one of his pockets turned inside out, and his watch gone—the guard still being on his neck, and broken, as if the watch had been plucked off instead of being taken over the head. The surgeon who made the *post-mortem* examination, found a gunshot wound in the belly, and shot marks around it. There was also a gash in the throat; some teeth were knocked out, many loosened, the nose smashed in, and a slight wound on the right eye and on the chin. The wound on the neck had not produced death, and the wound in the belly would not have caused instantaneous death, but the man after receiving it might have uttered a cry.

Nothing could be found by which the perpetrators of this barbarous deed could be traced; and the evidence upon which the prisoners were arrested and put on their trial was entirely circumstantial. On the day of the murder a farmer, named Stobart, accidentally passing down Smales' Lane, met two men, whose appearance he liked so little that he hesitated to pass them. The men much resembled the prisoners at the bar, both in size and dress; one of them had a stick or gun under his arm. They looked very hard at him as he passed them. When Mr. Stobart had passed on a short distance he met a young man, who seems sufficiently identified as the unfortunate Mr. Stirling; he was walking very fast. A few minutes

afterwards Mr. Stobart heard a gun-shot, from the direction in which he had met the two men and in which Mr. Stirling had proceeded. A woman, named Robinson, had entered the lane at this time, and heard the shot. Had either the men or Mr. Stirling passed along the lane she must have met them; but she saw nobody, until she saw Mr. Stobart. Mr. Stobart, though he must have heard of the murder, appears to have been unaware of the importance of his testimony; until his sister, hearing that a man had been murdered at this spot, became alarmed for her brother's safety: the consequence of her inquiries was, that Mr. Stobart related what he had seen. The man Cain was a notorious character, and kept an illicit still within the wood in which the corpse was found, and was best known as "Whisky Jack." Rayne also was well-known as his confederate. Some weeks after the murder was discovered, Cain was arrested by the police on the charge of keeping the concealed still; and Rayne was also taken into custody in consequence of his having offered for pledge a watch similar to that worn by Mr. Stirling. The proof against them, though leaving little doubt that one of them, at least, was concerned in the murder, was certainly inconclusive. Mr. Stobart identified the two prisoners as the persons he had seen in the lane. Immediately after the report of the gun was heard, a man, who was working in a field, saw a man come out of the wood; he had a gun under his arm, and, on seeing the witness, immediately drew back into the wood. A few days afterwards Rayne pledged a gun to a publican in the neighbourhood for

drink. A few days after the corpse was found, a discovery was made which, slight as it was, seemed to connect Cain with the murder. Curiosity attracted the neighbouring peasantry to the scene of the murder; and, as some boys were playing about, they discovered in the grass a glass waistcoat button. It was of a rather peculiar pattern, and somewhat worn. In Cain's house was found a waistcoat having similar buttons, but one was wanting; nor could it be suggested that he might have lost this one by accident on the spot, for he declared, in his answer to the charge of murder, that he had never been near the place, either before or since. Another circumstance of strong suspicion against Cain was a conversation in which he had taken part, and in which he gave such an account of the manner in which the murder had been perpetrated, and of the locality in which it had taken place, as could only have been given (it was urged by the counsel for the Crown) by one who had been personally present at the deed. With regard to Rayne, it was alleged that the day after the murder he had offered a watch, answering the description of that worn by the murdered man, for pledge to a pawnbroker in Durham, first asking 30s.; and, on the pawnbroker declining to take it, gradually reduced his demand to 4s. As the pawnbroker refused the loan, it could not be made certain that the watch offered was Mr. Stirling's; nor, indeed, could the pawnbroker sufficiently identify the prisoner Rayne as being the man. Cain and Rayne were both seen in Durham at this time.

Another piece of circumstantial evidence, taken with other facts.

bore strongly against Cain, though it would to a certain extent reduce the evidence against Rayne. Whoever shot Mr. Stirling, and dragged his body into the wood, must have had his clothes or shirt marked with blood. It appeared that a girl named Elizabeth Wilson, servant with Mrs. Kirkley, who keeps a public-house in the Castle-garth, Newcastle, frequently saw "Whisky Jack" at the house, and had seen him bring spirits to Mrs. Kirkley. The girl stated that she rose early one morning, and, on going into the kitchen, she found "Whisky Jack" there asleep. On being awoke he asked her if she had got much to do, and asked her if she would wash him a shirt? There was another man with Cain, but that man was not the prisoner Rayne, but that man, whoever he was, had a gun. This gun could not be Rayne's property, as his gun was then in pledge. The girl told Cain that she had no objection to wash him a shirt, provided he got her mistress's consent. Cain then pulled off his coat, when she observed that he had two shirts on—one white and the other blue. Cain pulled off the white one, and said he had worn it three weeks or a month. The shirt she found was covered with blood, both on the breast and on the sleeves, and the latter so much so as to appear as if they had been wrung out. On finding this she said, "Canny man, where have you been?" when Cain replied, "It is no use saying anything, as I have been here, there, and everywhere. I have been skinning a hare; and if anybody asks you about the shirt you must say so." As to the other man, he also gave a shirt to wash more bloody than that of "Whisky Jack's." "Why,"

said the girl, "you have not both been killing a hare?"—upon which the men both laughed. They next asked for something to clean a gun, for which they got a piece of rag; after which they left the house, and on their return, the shirts being ready, they got them, and took their departure.

A great many other circumstances, tending to show that the prisoners were the persons who had committed this murder, were adduced by the police; but they were certainly inconclusive: and the jury, after hearing the able analysis of the evidence by the prisoners' counsel, acquitted them both.

29. GOODWOOD RACES. — The annual races at Goodwood maintained their old character. For the Goodwood Stakes, 25 horses started. The winner was Mr. Barber's *Pretty Boy*. Ten horses started for the Cup which was won by Mr. H. Hill's *Rogerthorpe*. During the race for the Stakes on Wednesday the 30th, a serious accident occurred. A horse named *Chevy Chase* "bolted" up an embankment, and rolled over backwards into the middle of the ruck. The whole race was thrown into confusion. Six horses and their riders were thrown down, and the remainder either swerved past, or leapt over them. Of the seven jockeys, five were seriously hurt. Bartholomew and Hearnden received concussion of the brain, and were thought to be killed; Ashmall's collar-bone was broken; Mundy's right thigh and collar-bone were fractured. *Chevy Chase* was so frightfully injured that she was killed on the course. The other horses rose and galloped wildly over the course, some of them kicking and fighting furiously.

30. CHARGE OF EMBEZZLEMENT AGAINST A BANK MANAGER. — Another of those serious acts of fraud and embezzlement which have disgraced the time, has been discovered at Tewkesbury. Mr. Cornelius Evans, manager of the Tewkesbury Branch of the Gloucestershire Banking Company, was committed for trial, on a charge of embezzling moneys of the bank to the amount of 3250*l*.

The accused was appointed manager of the bank in September, 1849, and so continued in the confidence of his principals up to the beginning of April in the present year, when he resigned in consequence of some difference between him and the general manager of the Gloucestershire Bank. He was succeeded by Mr. Appleby, the present manager, who in the beginning of the present month, on striking the quarterly balance to June the 30th, discovered a deficiency of 3250*l*. Mr. Evans had that morning called upon Mr. Appleby and told him that he would find a deficiency of 1750*l*., and offered two checks for 500*l*. each in discharge of 1000*l*. of that amount, which he said had been advanced to Mr. Humphrey Brown, M.P. He also told him to debit him with 750*l*., which he said had been advanced to other persons, viz. 500*l*. to Mr. H. Allen, and 250*l*. to Mr. S. Nind. But there was still a sum of 1500*l*. deficient, and of this deficiency Mr. Evans refused to give any explanation, although he had been applied to for the purpose. The deficiency was not discovered until the making out of the quarterly balances as it could not be detected until those balances were examined.

Charles Chadborn, cashier and ledger-keeper at the bank, de-

scribed the manner in which the accounts had been “cooked.” Under Evans’s orders he had, at the balance time at Michaelmas, 1855, carried out the balances due to different customers, as being in some cases 500*l*., and in others 250*l*. less than the actual amount. The witness mentioned the accounts of four customers of the bank which had been so treated, making the four balances in the aggregate, 1750*l*. less than their actual amount. Mr. Evans’s instructions to him were, to take 1750*l*. out of such accounts as would bear it, as he said there would be a deficiency to that amount, and witness was not to take the amount from such accounts as were returned in the diary to Mr. Hartland. This witness’s evidence went to show that the same system had been adopted in making out the balances in the two succeeding quarters, the last being at Lady-day; soon after which time Evans left the bank. He also instructed him to make a false entry in the accounts of the quantity of bank notes in hand, falsifying them to the extent of 500*l*. He said he had had the 500*l*. himself.

The prisoner was tried on the 5th of August, before Mr. Justice Wightman, who directed the jury that the prisoner, being a customer of the bank, with authority to overdraw his account, as well as manager, the charge of felony could not be supported. A verdict of *Not Guilty* was accordingly returned.

31. TRIAL FOR MURDERING AN INFANT. — Ann Matthews, aged 32, James George, aged 19, and Richard Jose, aged 35, were indicted for the wilful murder of an infant, born of Matthews, at Truro, on the 27th of March. A second

count charged Matthews and George with harbouring Jose after he had committed the murder.

The details of the crime with which the prisoners were charged were singularly atrocious.

Matthews was a widow, with three children, and was accounted respectable. About twelve months ago, she met with the prisoner Jose; an intimacy arose between them, and soon afterwards he came to lodge at her house, and from that time, they had lived in a state of adultery—for Jose was a married man. In the same house were living the prisoner George, and a young woman, named Eliza Burns, 19 years old, who maintained an improper intimacy with George. Matthews became with child. The greatest secrecy as to this fact was maintained, because she had an allowance from the parish for herself and her children, which she was afraid would be withdrawn if she had a natural child. Some attempts had been made to procure abortion, but had failed. On the evening of the 26th of March, the pains of labour appear to have commenced. Matthews complained of being very ill, and retired early to bed. Jose came home from his work, but did not go to bed that night. George and Burns went to bed, leaving Jose sitting up in the kitchen. About 4 o'clock on the morning of Thursday, the 27th of March, Matthews rose from her bed and went down into the kitchen, and was there delivered of a female child. Jose also was down stairs, and he called the girl Burns, and asked her to come down to assist Matthews. Burns soon went down, but found the kitchen door fastened. She asked Jose to open it, but he said he could not leave

Matthews. During the time she was standing at the door, she heard Matthews groan and a child cry strongly. She at length got into the room, and saw Matthews, Jose, and a baby. George came down, and then Jose asked George to help Matthews up stairs, which he proceeded to do. As Matthews was going out of the room, she told Jose to stop the child's crying. After George and Matthews had left the room, Jose thrust his finger down the throat of the child with great violence, but that did not destroy its life. He did this for five minutes. He then said that would not do, and he went into another room and fetched a pan, into which he poured a quantity of water from a pitcher, and he then put the child into the water and drowned it. After the child was destroyed, the body was placed in a cupboard in the kitchen; but Burns said she would not work in the room if the body remained there, and Jose then took it up stairs into Matthews's room, and put it in a box. Burns went up to Matthews, who asked if the child was dead. At a subsequent period of the day, Matthews told Burns not to tell, for, if she did, Jose would be hung, and she should get into trouble. The two men went to their work, and returned in the evening about 6 o'clock; a conversation then arose as to how the body should be disposed of, and Jose asked George to go with him to a certain pond, and he took down a basket and put the body in it, and he and George took the child from the house, and carried it to a pond about a mile or two from Truro. Jose then attached a stone to the body by a cord, and threw it into the pond. On their return, Mat-

thews asked what they had done with the child, and Jose told her. Matthews said it would be sure to be found; but Jose said he was not afraid of that; people might go to Australia and not find it. Matthews begged them to say nothing, or Jose would be hung. On Friday, the 28th of March, Burns, who was dreadfully flurried with what she had seen, left the house and went to her mother's. On Saturday, the 29th of March, about 3 or 4 in the afternoon, a boy named Truscott was fishing in the pond, and observed the appearance of the hand of a child in the water, which was unusually low at that time. He gave an alarm, and told a man, named Snell, what he had seen. Snell went to the pond, and took up the body of a child, disunited it from the stone to which it was tied, and took it into the town of Truro to the Union Hotel, and then informed Mr. Painter, a surgeon, who went and saw it. He found it to be the body of a female child full grown, and that it had been born alive, and had come to its death by suffocation. A coroner's inquest was held, and a verdict of "Wilful murder against some person or persons unknown" was returned. On that evening, Burns went to see Matthews. As they were talking, Matthews' little child came in, and said the body of a child had been found in the pond. Matthews said she was sure it was her child, and begged Burns not to say anything about it, or Jose would be hung.

When suspicion arose, these wretched people plainly talked among themselves as to the probability of discovery, and enough was admitted fully to confirm their guilt.

The girl Burns was, of course,

the principal witness. She told her horrid tale with every appearance of truth and candour; but the only emotion of hesitation she appears to have shown was rather superstitious than conscientious, for she seems to have been reluctant to work in the same room with the dead body of the infant.

The horrid narrative of Burns seemed to be confirmed by many particulars; indeed the prisoners did not deny their guilt as to murdering the child, but merely gave a different account of the manner in which the crime had been effected.

An attempt was made on behalf of the prisoners to avoid the consequences of the accusation by objecting to the evidence of Burns as an accomplice; but the learned Judge (Baron Martin) pointed out that nothing was alleged against her showing her to be an accomplice either before or after the deed: on the contrary, that she appeared to have voluntarily divulged the whole transaction. His lordship added, that although there was no evidence to fix any one with the murder but that of Eliza Burns, still they were quite at liberty to act upon her evidence, and, if they believed her, it was as foul a murder as ever was committed, as regarded the prisoner Jose.

The jury then said they had agreed, and they found Jose *Guilty* of manslaughter; George *Guilty* as an accessory after the fact; and Matthews *Guilty* of concealing the birth.

Baron Martin said, it was his duty to state that in the paper the jury had sent in to him, they had asked him whether they could find Jose guilty of manslaughter. He had some doubt about it, and had consulted his brother Channell, and the answer he had sent the

jury was, that he himself should either find him guilty of murder or acquit him; but he did not know any legal obstacle to their finding him guilty of manslaughter. The jury had taken a most merciful view of the case. His opinion certainly would have been that he should have either found him guilty of murder, or have acquitted him; but it was the verdict of the jury, and he should therefore sentence Jose to be transported for life, and Matthews and George to twelve months' imprisonment.

The evident absurdity of this verdict was the subject of much comment. It was doubtless a compromise. It is clear that if the girl Burns was to be believed, a more horrible murder could not have been committed; if she was not, the accused were entitled to an acquittal.

AUGUST.

3. DOUBLE MURDER AT FOLKESTONE.—A double murder, of which the atrocity is only equalled by the singular circumstances of premeditation, has been committed near Folkestone. The Foreign Legion, raised during the war, was located in the camp at Shorncliffe, between Folkestone and Dover, for instruction and discipline. Considering that the men who composed this force were raised from the loose and discontented portion of foreign communities, their conduct was, on the whole, very satisfactory; but some very disorderly scenes occurred. The perpetrator of these dreadful deeds was a private in the British Swiss Legion, named Dedea Redanies, a native of Servia. This man had formed a licentious acquaintance with a girl at Dover, named Caroline

Back, whose family appear to have washed the linen of the officers of the camp. Having induced this girl, and her sister Maria, to accompany him over the downs towards the camp, he, from an indescribable emotion of jealousy, murdered them both. He appears to have committed the atrocity with such skill and effect, that his victims offered no resistance, but fell with the passiveness of sheep in the slaughterhouse. When pursued, the villain stabbed himself three times in the breast, but failed to inflict mortal wounds, and survived to experience the vengeance of the law. The details of these horrible deeds are given with startling simplicity by the witnesses before the coroner's jury.

Thomas Gurling, carpenter, of Folkestone, said, on Sunday morning, about eight o'clock, he left Folkestone with a friend, and proceeded nearly as far as Dover, and returned as far as the Steddy Hole, when he sat down on a cliff reading for about half an hour. He was trying to find a path down to the beach when he saw the dead bodies of two girls. The first he came to was Maria's body, the youngest, whose clothes were disordered. He looked at her face and dress, and found it was saturated with blood about the chest. He called assistance, and then he went to the other girl, who was also dead. The blood was on her clothes, and her fingers were cut. They were lying about fifteen yards from each other when he saw them. When he discovered them they were both dead. He saw they were both wounded about the chest.

John Back deposed that he was a labourer, of Dover. The deceased were his daughters. Had

known Dedea Redanies seven or eight months. They were well acquainted. Redanies went to his house at eight o'clock on Saturday night, and left at half-past nine, and did not return again till about a quarter to three in the morning. The deceased were going to Folkestone, and Redanies proposed that they should accompany him to Shorncliffe Camp. Witness asked him if he would come and take breakfast before he started with the girls. It was proposed to have breakfast at three o'clock, but he came shortly before three o'clock. Witness breakfasted with Redanies and the two girls. Redanies and the girls left for his master's quarters shortly after three o'clock. There was no quarrelling between them, and they all seemed merry. Witness denied that Redanies had been "keeping company" with Caroline. His daughters were to have gone to Folkestone by the 6.15 train; but at Redanies' solicitation were induced to walk over the cliffs. Two silk capes were produced, which the witness identified as being his daughters'.

Mr. William Bateman, of Folkestone, was sent for to examine the bodies of the murdered girls. Examined the body of Maria Back, the youngest, first. He found her dress but little disordered. She had on her gloves and bonnet, and the front of her dress was buttoned close up to her neck. That part of her dress was saturated with blood. He found holes in the dress, on removing which he saw four incised wounds in the chest, each about half-an-inch in length, and penetrating deeply into the chest. There were two wounds on each side of the chest, between the second and fourth ribs, and, from the direction of the wounds, he was clearly of opinion that the

arch of the aorta was wounded, and that death took place almost instantly.

He then examined the body of Caroline Back. He found three wounds of the same sort in the chest; one of them had passed through the cartilage, another through the *sternum*, or chest bone, and the third was on the left breast, but that had not entered the chest. They were all stabs. There was also a stab in the left hand. Both of their chests were filled with blood. They had not bled much externally. The bodies were quite warm when he saw them, and on turning them over the blood gushed out of the wounds. A knife was produced, which Mr. Bateman said, was such an instrument as would have inflicted these wounds.

George Frier, the constable, deposed, that on the previous Monday he proceeded along the Ashford turnpike road, near the viaduct, where he saw a soldier, who immediately drew his hand from his breast, and threw the knife produced down to the ground. He then ran up and caught hold of him, as did also another man. Witness could not then see that he was bleeding. He then took one of the capes from the back of the soldier. Another girl's cloak remained on his back. There were three wounds in his left breast. One of the capes had three cuts in it, covered with fresh blood, and corresponding with the wounds in the body of Dedea Redanies.

George Marsh, ostler, deposed that about 5 o'clock on Sunday morning last he was sitting on a bank near the turnpike-road leading from Dover to Folkestone, when he saw two young women walking arm-in-arm with a soldier, who was rather a short man, and

appeared to be a foreigner. He asked witness what was the time, to which he answered, "5 o'clock." They then went on towards Folkestone talking and laughing.

Mrs. Elizabeth Atwood, wife of a tradesman at Lower Hardres, stated that on Monday last a soldier—a foreigner—came to the shop and asked if witness sold paper and envelopes, and she told him she did, and he purchased two sheets of bill paper, two envelopes, a bottle of ink, and a pen. He then asked if witness would let him write a letter, and she acquiesced. He sat down and wrote two letters, and put them in the envelopes, and went to the post-office. These letters were produced: one was addressed to "Miss Caroline Back, 3, Albion-place, Dover," and the other to "Ser Wilhelm Schmid, Leitnant of 4th Compagnie, 2d Regiment, 2d batalion Britis Swis Legion, Kamp Folkestone, next Dover." They were written in German, and were translated literally by a sworn interpreter, as follows:—

"Dearest Mother Back.—On the first lines, I pray to forgive me the awful accident to the unlucky Dedea Redanies which I committed upon my very dear Caroline and Maria Back yesterday morning at 5 o'clock. Scarcely I am able to write, by heartbreak for my ever memorable Caroline and Mary Ann. The cause of my deed is:—1. As I heard that Caroline is not in the family way, as I first believed. 2. Because Caroline intends to go to Woolwich. 3. Because I cannot stay with my very dear Caroline, it made my heart so scattered that I put into my mind at last that Caroline rather may die from my hands than to

allow Caroline's love being bestowed upon others. However, I did not intend to murder also Mary Ann, her sister, but not having other opportunity, and as she was in my way I could not do otherwise—I must stab her too. Dear Mother Back, Saturday evening when I came, I had not at least any intention to commit this awful act, but as I learned that my dear Caroline gave me back my likeness, and as she told me she would leave, I did not know any other way in my heartbreak than that leading to the cutler's, where I bought a poniard, which divided the hearty lovers. Arm by arm I brought both my dearest souls in the world over to the unlucky place near the road before Folkestone, and requested them to sit down, but the grass being wet they refused to do so, and I directed then, Caroline to go forwards, and I went behind Mary Ann, into whose heart I run the dagger. With a dull cry she dropped down. With a most broken heart I rushed then after Caroline, lifting the poniard in my hand towards her. "Dear Dedea," cried she, with half dead voice, and fell down with weeping eyes. Then I rushed over her and gave her the last kisses as an everlasting remembrance. I could not live a more dreadful hour in my life than that was, and my broken heart could not tell where my senses were gone, and I took both the black shawls of Mary Ann and my dear Caroline, as a mourning suit for me, leaving the awful spot with weeping eyes and a broken heart. Never shall I forget my dear Caroline and Mary Ann, and the poniard will be covered with the blood of Mary Ann and Caroline with me until it be put in my own breast, and I shall see again my dear Mary

Ann and Caroline in the eternal life. Farewell, and be careless about the blissfully deceased angels of God, and forgive the unhappy, ever weeping,

“DEDEA REDANIES.”

“Aug. 3, 1856.”

“Dearest Mr. Lieut. Schmid,—
With weeping eyes I entreat you to pardon me, the unhappy Dede, and I inform you in a few words that I did not intend to squander your watch, but to give it only as a pledge to sister Caroline, where you will receive back your watch from Mary Back, if you will be so good as to go to Dover yourself and reclaim it at the herementioned address—‘Miss Maria Back, 5, Albion-place, Dover.’ I also enclose the pawnticket for Dr. Baumgarten, and inform you that I have not got yet the watch. Unfortunately, I cannot enclose you the money which I spent from——. I sent a letter to the mother of Caroline, but it is in German, and I request you to take an early opportunity to go to Dover and translate the letter for her. Dear Mr. Lieutenant Schmid, keep the portrait and locket of hair attached to it, as an eternal remembrance of that fearful Sunday when both the girls, who were my never-to-be-forgotten sadness and joy—(Here the sentence breaks off abruptly.) Dear Mr. Lieutenant Schmid, I thank you for every good thing I experienced with you, and pardon the unhappy Dede Redanies, who am ready any minute before my being arrested to kill myself with the same dagger with which I murdered my only joy. With the request that you will translate the other letter to Mrs. Back, which I sent her with your own”—(the word

following is illegible) “gratefully,
—DEDEA REDANIES.”

“A thousand compliments to you, with tears, dear Schmid.”

The jury returned a unanimous verdict of “Wilful murder against Dede Redanies” in both cases. The assassin was tried at the Maidstone assizes, convicted and executed.

5. RIOTS AT KELSO. — Some serious riots occurred at Kelso, on the occasion of St. James’s Fair, on the 5th and 6th August. The disturbance arose out of national jealousy, deflecting into religious animosity. It appears that on the 5th a general row took place between the Scotch and Irish residents in the town on attending the fair, in the course of which one of the Scotch was killed. The perpetrators of this outrage managed to elude justice, but next day, among the lower classes, a proposal was circulated that they should drive the Irish out of the town, and burn the Roman Catholic chapel. On the evening of the 6th a considerable number of people were collected in the Mill-wynd and Market-place, and in the neighbourhood of the shows and public-houses. Before this assemblage dispersed signals were made, and the hostile purpose seemed pretty generally understood and sympathized in, for 100 persons or more, led on by exciting cries, began to move towards the chapel. They first proceeded up Roxburgh Street, and coming to Dan Martin’s, keeper of a lodging-house frequented by the Irish, threatened to clear it, and drive the inmates out of the town, but were diverted, somehow or other, from this purpose. Proceeding to the end of

the street, they were joined by another party awaiting them at the Duke of Roxburgh's gate, and thus reinforced they came back by the parallel street (Bowmont Street), in which the Roman Catholic chapel is situated. The crowd invaded the chapel, broke its windows and destroyed its furniture, and concluded by so effectually setting fire to it that in little more than an hour it was reduced to ruins. As the police force of the little town consists of a superintendent and one constable, they could of course do nothing to check the disturbance; which appears to have subsided when this serious act of retaliation had been completed. Some of the rioters were secured, and sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment with hard labour.

12. TOTAL DESTRUCTION OF MESSRS. BROADWOOD'S PIANOFORTE MANUFACTORY.—A fire of great magnitude, involving immense destruction of valuable property, illuminated the western districts of the metropolis for several hours.

Upon a plot of ground exceeding a couple of acres in extent, and running from the Horseferry Road to Holywell Street, Westminster, have stood for the last thirty years the principal manufacturing workshops of Messrs. Broadwood, the famous pianoforte makers. The premises consisted of five distinct ranges of buildings, three stories high, running parallel with each other, and embracing shops for every department of the manufacture. At six o'clock last evening 420 workmen left the various shops in the establishment, and one of the foremen inspected the whole premises after their departure, for the purpose of ascertaining that everything was safe, and the stove fires properly ex-

tinguished. In little more than half an hour after, smoke was observed issuing from the upper floor of the central range of buildings. An alarm was instantly given to one of the managers, who got some assistance, and conveyed two or three lengths of hose and a branch to the spot where the fire was raging. His efforts were however defeated by the scarcity of the supply of water, which almost immediately stopped altogether. The contract of the water company was to have the mains charged every night at six o'clock, but at a quarter to seven the supply failed at the only one tested out of twelve contracted for. The flames spread rapidly from floor to floor, and before seven o'clock had wrapped in one burning mass the whole range in which the fire had originated. The peculiar construction of the workshops—built to obtain the best possible light, and consisting of distinct floors several hundred feet long, without a break of any kind—rendered them an easy prey to the flames, and in less than an hour the fire had obtained so terrible a mastery that very little hope existed from that time of saving any portion of the establishment. The intense heat of the central building very soon ignited the adjoining ranges on either side, though from 20 to 30 feet of space separated the one from the other; and before 8 o'clock a body of flame of almost unexampled extent rose high into the air, setting out in bold relief the fine architectural outlines of the new Palace and the venerable Abbey, and attracting to the bridges, and other elevated points of view, myriads of curious spectators.

Out of the five ranges of shops four had ignited, when it was de-

terminated by a desperate effort to cut off the communication with the fifth range; and by the employment of a large number of men with pickaxes, and other implements—the wind favouring this operation—the flames were prevented extending to the northernmost shops, which, beyond injury from severe scorching and water, did not suffer. The rest of the vast manufactory was totally destroyed. Nearly 1000 pianofortes, in various stages of manufacture, were utterly lost, and the value of the woods and other materials destroyed amounts to an immense sum. Two hundred instruments were rescued, and to this salvage must be added a large quantity of lime wood and ebony, which being stacked in the northern extremity of the premises escaped destruction. The tools of the workmen, in the aggregate of very great value, were destroyed. The tools of a single first-class workman may be estimated at 70*l*.

13. COLLIERY EXPLOSION.—An explosion occurred at the Ramrod-hall Colliery, near Oldbury, Worcestershire, the property of Lord Ward, by which eleven lives were sacrificed, besides serious injuries being inflicted upon others. The works had been standing for a few days previously to Wednesday. On that day the men were about resuming work, and a party of nine miners had descended into the pit in safety, but, finding that there were indications of the presence of fire-damp, they called to a second party about to descend, not to bring lighted candles with them, but to provide themselves with safety lamps. The warning, however, was disregarded, and six more miners, accompanied by a ganger or doggy, got into the skip or bas-

ket at the pit's mouth, to be conveyed down the shaft, carrying with them a lighted candle. In this way the skip was lowered by the engine, until it arrived nearly at the bottom of the pit, when the lighted candle ignited the foul air, and a fearful explosion took place, blowing the unfortunate miners with the skip to a great height out of the pit. Of course every man in the skip was killed, and their bodies mutilated in a fearful manner, so that they could with difficulty be recognised by their friends. Three of the men in the pit were also killed.

29. BOILER EXPLOSION NEAR BURY.—Nine persons have been killed by a boiler explosion at the bleach and dye works of Messrs. Warburton and Holker, near Bury. It appeared at the inquest, that when the boiler was made, ten years ago, it was calculated to work at a pressure of 40*lb*. to the square inch, but on an examination made since the accident, it was found that in places an exterior corrosion from dampness in the brickwork had reduced the plates from the original thickness of $\frac{3}{8}$ to $\frac{1}{8}$ of an inch, and to this the explosion was mainly attributable.

30. ATTEMPTED MURDER AND SUICIDE.—A dreadful outrage took place at Dudley. For some time past a young man named John Dance had been paying attentions to a first cousin of his own, daughter of Mr. Thomas Barr, landlord of the Seven Stars Inn, Hall Street. She was an amiable and much-respected young woman, while he was of unsteady and irregular habits. It was probably owing to this circumstance, that her parents discouraged his visits to their house, in which course Miss Barr fully coincided. On

several occasions he had been heard to threaten to take her life if she would not consent to have him, but these threats were disregarded. On Saturday night, about ten o'clock, he went to the house. Being somewhat tipsy, both Miss Barr and her parents ordered him to leave, and he did so, but not without muttering something to the young lady to the effect that "she would not order him out the next time he came." About twelve o'clock on the same night, Miss Barr and her mother were engaged in their usual avocations about the house, when Dance entered by the back door, and walked up to the young woman, who was then going along the passage leading from a back room to the bar. Pulling a pistol from his pocket, he discharged it at the young woman. The charge took effect in her neck and lower jaw, and she at once fell to the ground. In another moment a second shot was heard, and the guilty man lay dead upon the floor. He had placed the pistol close to his left ear, the shot penetrated the brain, and death was instantaneous.

SEPTEMBER.

3. FAILURE OF THE ROYAL BRITISH BANK.—The fearful frauds revealed by the failure of the Tipperary Bank have been equalled by the disclosures attending the stoppage of an English establishment—the Royal British Bank. In truth, considering the number of persons who were combined in the mal-practices in the latter case, it may be considered to be a still more startling instance of commercial dishonesty.

It had been for some time reported that there was something amiss, and the shares had fallen

considerably; but at the last half-yearly meeting the Directors announced their determination, with a view to the permanent interests of the shareholders, to reduce the dividend from the rate of six to four per cent., in order thereby to make more than ordinary provision for bad and doubtful debts. This resolve had no effect; it was clear that some parties were too well acquainted with the real state of things. Sales were pressed; a run on the deposits took place; and on Wednesday the Bank closed.

It is impossible to describe the general confusion that arose among the shareholders and depositors, when the real state of the Bank affairs became known. The share capital was put at 300,000*l.*, of which 150,000*l.* was said to be "paid up." The debts due to depositors were upwards of 500,000*l.*; the assets consisted of bills discounted and other securities. It soon became known that the greater part of these securities were worthless; that more than 100,000*l.* had been advanced, under extraordinary circumstances, to a Welsh coal mine, which was not one-third of the value; and that the directors, manager, and auditors had been helping themselves to the funds without scruple. Mr. Gwynne, a retired director, was indebted 13,600*l.*; Mr. John McGregor, M.P., the founder of the bank, 7000*l.*; Mr. Humphrey Brown, M.P., upwards of 70,000*l.*; Mr. Cameron, the manager, about 30,000*l.*; that the loss by money taken by the directors exceeded 120,000*l.* The general aspect of affairs was, that when the shareholders had paid up their calls, there might be about 8*s.* or 10*s.* in the pound for the creditors, with the entire loss of the capital of the

Bank. This state of things was bad enough; but what ensued rendered the calamity still more serious. The lawyers got hold of the debts, and sued the individual shareholders right and left; sometimes a hundred writs were issued for a single claim. To avoid this ruinous procedure, an attempt was made to wind up the company under the Winding-up Act. This proceeded to some extent; an official manager was appointed, who got in a large sum of money, and called upon the shareholders to pay up a call of 75*l.* per share. But another set of creditors resolved to have the affairs of the company wound up by the Court of Bankruptcy, and a fiat was accordingly issued, and assignees appointed. This step was resisted, on the ground that the Winding-up Act being in operation, the power of the Bankruptcy Court was superseded. But it did not appear that there was any express provision to that effect; and the official assignee proceeded to enforce his call upon the unhappy shareholders of 50*l.* per share. Thus the unfortunate persons, having already paid one-half of their undertaking, were now called upon to pay 125*l.* per share more. Many were absolutely unable to meet the demand by the sacrifice of all they possessed; others could have only done so by robbing their trade creditors. In consequence, some fled abroad, and left their creditors to seize their property; others carried off what they could, and settled with their legitimate creditors at a safe distance; many went through the Insolvent and Bankrupt Courts. The two official gentlemen then commenced a fight between themselves for the plunder. In short, such a scene of waste, litigation, and misery en-

sued, as is painful to contemplate.

The affairs of this unfortunate undertaking, therefore, became more and more complicated as time went on, and came to a climax in the following year, when, in consequence of the decision of the Judge in Bankruptcy, upon the conduct of the directors and officials, the Government took up the matter, and ordered some of these persons to be criminally prosecuted.

3. FALL OF A HOUSE IN THE CITY.—Shortly after midnight a calamitous accident, resulting in the death of four persons, and serious injuries to several others, occurred in the fall of a house, No. 9, Little Swan Alley, situate at the rear of Tokenhouse Yard, and on the east side of Moorgate Street. The neighbourhood swarms with a dense population, chiefly of a very humble class, and living for the most part in small wretched houses in the last stage of dilapidation, and let out in single rooms, at trifling sums, collected weekly. It is a perfect labyrinth of confined courts and alleys, dingy and ill-ventilated. The house which fell consisted of two floors, with a cellar beneath, and was occupied by three separate families, numbering in the aggregate fifteen persons. At the dead of night, when most of the unhappy people were in bed, it fell with an awful crash, entombing nearly the whole of them in the ruins. All, however, were eventually saved, except one man and his three step-children. On these an inquest was held, at which the following account of the catastrophe was given by the mother of the children who had perished.

Elizabeth Pullen deposed that she lived with Palmer, the deceased. The three children now

dead were hers, and resided with her and Palmer in Little Swan-alley at the time of the accident. She occupied the first floor back. The front room of the first floor was occupied by other persons. About four months ago she lived in the room of a Mrs. Marsh, at 2s. a week, and continued her tenant till about six weeks since, when Mr. Crane became the landlord of the premises, and she had since that paid the rent to him. She had complained to Mrs. Marsh of the state of the house. There was only one room on the ground floor; the floor of the room underneath that she occupied had been taken away. Last Saturday night week she complained to Mr. Crane, when she paid him her rent, of the state of the floor, and pointed out the broken state of the flooring near the fireplace. The wood was much decayed. As he stood at the door he looked at the place, and said he would see to it. He did not call again until Sunday last, when he came for his rent. On Sunday last she paid him again her rent, but nothing had occurred then to excite her alarm. In the course of the evening she fancied she heard a cracking noise, and noticed it to the deceased, Palmer, and said she should soon get out of the house. About 9 o'clock on Tuesday night she heard a cracking noise near the fireplace. It appeared to be in the place where she had heard it before. She and the deceased, Palmer, had not then retired. All the family slept in the same room. The children slept in a bed under the place where she heard the noise. Herself, Palmer, and the baby slept in one bed, and the three children now dead in the other. About 10 o'clock they retired to rest, and

about 5 minutes past 12 she was awoke by her child. She got out of bed to give him something, and walked the room with him for a short time. She then heard a fearful cracking again. Her hushing the child did not shake the room. The room began to shake very much, and she awoke Palmer and desired him to get up, as the house was falling. He got up and went to the children, and she opened her room door and alarmed the other inmates overhead. While standing on the top of the stairs outside her door, one-half of the floor of the room gave way, the window fell, and was smashed all to pieces, as was also the fireplace; hearing the crash she tried to run down stairs; the shaking of the house threw down the stairs, and she and her baby were thrown into the street; but how it happened she had no recollection.

Mr. E. Woodthorpe, district surveyor, said that the houses in Little Swan-alley were from 150 to 200 years old. The exterior walls of the house were not in so ruinous a condition as those of many in the neighbourhood; but the interior woodwork was all worm-eaten and rotten. In his judgment the interior of the house fell bodily, from decay of the ends of the rafters. The weight of the people within the house was too much for the rotten timbers to bear.

The coroner's jury returned a verdict of "Accidental Death."

3. ACCIDENT AT THE WELLINGTON BARRACKS.—A serious accident has occurred by the fall of a portion of the new wing in course of erection at the Wellington Barracks, in James Street, Buckingham Gate. About 10 o'clock

a potman from a neighbouring public-house ascended the scaffold for the purpose of supplying the labourers engaged in the work with their morning beer. These latter appear to have assembled together for this purpose, some standing on the coping-stone of the newly-erected wall, while others remained on the scaffold. As the potman was in the act of pouring out a half-pint of beer for one of the men, who had taken his position on the corner stone, he observed it to crack, and the outer portion of it to cant over. He immediately threw himself backwards on to the roof of the building and thus escaped. The stone, however, fell with such violence on to the scaffold as to precipitate it to the ground, carrying with it no less than six of the workmen. Of these one was killed on the spot, while the others received such severe injuries as to render their recovery very doubtful.

4. SHIPWRECK.—News has just been received of the total loss of the ship *Western Bride*, near the Straits of Magellan. She left the Chincha Islands on the coast of Peru with a cargo of guano on the 5th February, 1856, and was bound for Queenstown, Ireland. She fell in with very tempestuous weather about the 26th of the same month, which rendered her unmanageable, and after stopping at Port Famine in the Straits of Magellan in an ineffectual attempt to repair the damages she had sustained, she ran on a sunken rock off Point Barranca, about 2 P.M. on the 8th of March, the wind at the time blowing very hard and the sea running high. The vessel continued to strike very heavily until 4.30 P.M., when the force of

the wind and the sea drove her over the bank of rocks on which she had grounded, and she floated again. It was not for long, however, for the injuries she had received while on the rocks were so great, that no sooner had she got into deep water than she began to make water. The crew made an effort to man the pumps, but to no purpose, for she foundered so rapidly as barely to give them time to launch two boats, disappearing as soon as they were clear of her. At 9 P.M., wet, cold, and hungry, the crew managed to make Baxa Point, on the Fuegian side of the Straits, where they landed with only a few soaked biscuits, and no water. Notwithstanding the coldness of the night they were debarred of the comforts of a fire through fear of attracting the notice of the natives, whom they supposed to be cannibals. In this wretched plight they remained for five days, when, seeing nothing but starvation before them, they again took to their boats, and after suffering the greatest agony from hunger and thirst for several days, at last happily reached a small Chilian settlement on that coast. Here they were well entertained until the arrival of the U.S. ship *Bainbridge*, the commander of which gave them a passage to Monte Video.

4. LOSS OF A STEAMBOAT BY FIRE. — By the last mail from America, accounts arrived of the total loss of the steamer *Niagara*, by fire, on Lake Michigan. The *Niagara*, Captain Miller, was one of the regular packets which ran from Collingwood to Chicago, and left the former city on Monday, the 22nd of September last, at 2 P.M., with 150 to 170 passengers and a valuable cargo.

All went well until 4 P.M. on the following Wednesday, when she was discovered to be on fire on the lower deck. The ship was at the time off Port Washington, the nearest land being from three to four miles distant. Immediately the fire was discovered, Captain Miller, who was asleep in his cabin, was summoned, and he ordered the steam-pumps to be at once set to work. This attracted the notice of the passengers, who soon became aware of the reason for these precautions. A scene then took place which, in the words of an eye-witness, "beggared description." A sudden panic and consternation fell upon the passengers, which deprived them of all power to make provision for their escape. They gave no assistance to the crew in their endeavours to extinguish the fire, but wildly rushed up and down the deck, shrieking and crying for aid. Before the flames had reached the upper cabin, numbers threw themselves into the water, without any means of support. Mothers were seen to throw their children into the lake, and then madly to spring after them. The water at this time was intensely cold, so that none but the hardiest could live in it beyond a few moments. The consequence was, that all these persons perished. Two bodies of the passengers, in spite of all remonstrances, got into the stern and starboard quarter-boats, and lowered themselves in such a manner that they swamped and consigned all within them to a watery grave. Those who displayed more self-possession, managed to preserve their lives, by attaching themselves to chairs, tables, and other articles, upon which they floated, until aid was rendered by

the neighbouring vessels. The crew appear to have showed the greatest coolness during these frightful scenes, and when all hope of saving the vessel was over, they lowered the only remaining boat, and taking a number of passengers with them, pulled to the nearest shore, and after landing the useless hands, returned to give all further aid in their power.

Captain Miller, who was much praised for his intrepidity and presence of mind, remained to the last, and was ultimately picked up clinging to the wheel of the unfortunate steamer. Sixty or seventy persons are reported to have lost their lives on this occasion, but owing to the loss of the papers belonging to the vessel, the number could not be ascertained with accuracy. Indeed, had it not been for the promptness displayed by the boats of the neighbouring vessels, and the opportune arrival of the life-boat from Port Washington, scarcely a person would have escaped, owing to the inclemency of the season.

The hulk of the *Niagara* drafted for about 4 miles, and then sunk within a mile and a half of the shore. She was valued at seventy-five thousand dollars, and will prove a total loss. Some suspicion appears to be entertained that the fire was the work of an incendiary.

5. FATAL RAILWAY ACCIDENT. —Mr. Lewis Morgan, a gentleman of property in the neighbourhood of Merthyr Tydvil, has been killed by a train, on his way home from Merthyr. About half-a-mile below the Taff Vale Station, at a place called Brandy Bridge, is an old parish road crossing the railway which is much used, but

without gates on either side. The night was exceedingly dark, and the animal the deceased rode was a very restive colt. Just as the up-train from Cardiff came along, the deceased arrived at the crossing, and being somewhat in liquor, struck his horse, and endeavoured to cross in front of the engine, but it seems that neither the engineer nor the stoker saw anything till after the animal had been struck, nor even then could they tell what had happened. The engine was, however, immediately reversed and brought to a standstill, after proceeding about 150 yards further; when a horrifying spectacle presented itself. All along the line and among the wheels were fragments of the body of the deceased—a leg was in one place, an arm in another, a hand in another, the head and part of the trunk in another, and the heart in another, while fragments of flesh and bones were scattered about in all directions, and some thrown a considerable distance. The horse was also dreadfully mutilated, and a surgeon who made his appearance was several times appealed to to decide what portion of the fragments belonged to the horse, and what were parts of the human body. In a pocket-book found in one of the pockets of the deceased were notes amounting to 270*l.*, which he had that day received at the Brecon Old Bank, and on the following morning another pocket torn from the trousers of the deceased, containing 1*l.* 6*d.* in silver, was found attached to the wheels of the tender. From the marks of the horse's hoofs in the road, it would appear that the animal was struck by the buffer about the middle, just as it was crossing the outer rail, and carried a considerable

distance before it or its rider fell under the wheels.

7. FIRES IN THE METROPOLIS. —Three fires, involving a considerable loss of property, but happily unattended with any sacrifice of human life, occurred in the metropolis on the night of this day.

The first originated in the premises known as Rutland Wharf, Upper Thames Street, in the occupation of Messrs. Green and Southwick, corn factors. It was discovered by a policeman who was passing over Blackfriars' Bridge, and observed dense volumes of lurid smoke issuing from the windows of the warehouse. He gave the alarm, and shortly afterwards numerous fire-engines were on the spot. As usual, the efforts of the fire-brigade were very energetic, but it was not until the assistance of the powerful floating engine was obtained, that the adjoining premises could be said to be out of danger. The increased volume of water discharged by this engine speedily got the mastery over the fire; but in so doing, several hundreds of quarters of corn were carried by the force of the water into the Thames, many boat-loads of which were collected by lightermen and other persons in the course of the following day.

Another fire broke out about half-past 2, in an extensive carriage manufactory in Bedford Street, Euston Square, and, for some time defied the exertions of all engaged in subduing it. Eventually, however, the firemen succeeded in extinguishing the fire, but not until a serious amount of property had been destroyed.

The third occurred on the premises of Mr. Beatch, a leather manufacturer, in Paragon Place, New Kent Road, and extended to

the cowhouses and stables belonging to a dairyman adjoining. Property to the amount of 4000*l.* was consumed.

In all these instances the proprietors were insured.

18. COMBINATIONS AMONGST WORKMEN.—A trial of considerable interest to the manufacturing community took place at the Central Criminal Court to-day. It was of importance, as involving a question which has been much agitated of late years in the northern districts, namely, how far it is competent for the self-constituted bodies called 'Trades' Unions to interfere with the natural course of the labour market, and dictate to employers of labour on the one hand the terms on which alone they are to be suffered to engage their workmen, or by violence and intimidation on the other to prevent the labouring classes from accepting employment on such conditions as they may think proper to submit to. The law on this point is well known, and was thus enunciated during the course of the present trial:—

"It was quite competent for either masters or workmen to combine together for their mutual protection and for the advancement of their mutual interests. A master is at liberty to say that he will not give employment except upon certain terms, and workmen are equally at liberty to refuse their labour except upon certain conditions. Neither party, however, has a right to go beyond this, and the law will not permit persons who choose to accept other terms to be obstructed; and still less will it permit them to be intimidated."

The infrequency of prosecutions against parties who have

been guilty of the conduct here referred to, however, has arisen, not so much from the unsettled state of the law, as from the unwillingness of masters to take upon themselves the odium of instituting proceedings, or the difficulty of obtaining sufficient evidence.

On the present occasion Richard Gale, James Mumford, George Reeves, Edward Laton Hopper, John Brown, John Hopper, Frederick Young, Augustus Henry Fredericks, George Binet, and Stephen Moyse, ten well-dressed, respectable-looking young men, surrendered to take their trial upon an indictment, charging them with misdemeanor in having unlawfully conspired together to prevent and intimidate certain workmen from entering into the employment of Messrs. Young, Magnay, and Young, ship-builders.

The facts of the case, as they appeared from the evidence for the prosecution, were as follow:—

The prosecutors, Messrs. Young, Magnay, and Young, are eminent ship-builders, carrying on their business at Limehouse, and employing from 300 to 400 workmen, and the defendants, Fredericks, Reeves, and Binet, were formerly in their service. All the defendants were members of a union called the Shipwrights' Union. The object of this association was the protection of the interests of the trade, and Fredericks was the president of it. Reeves was the president of another society of the same description, called the Joiners' Union. Binet was a shipwright, a Jersey man by birth, and also a member of the union; and he took a very active part in the subsequent proceedings that took place in reference to Messrs. Young's

workmen. It would appear that in London, a certain practice has existed with regard to the hours of labour and to the periods of cessation during the day. The hours of labour were from 6 o'clock in the morning till 6 o'clock at night. The men worked from 6 to 8 o'clock in the morning, when they had half an hour for breakfast; they then worked till 11 o'clock, when they were allowed to leave for 20 minutes for beer; they then worked till 1 o'clock, when an hour's interval was allowed for dinner; they then went on with their work until 4 o'clock, when another interval of half an hour was allowed for beer, and the men then resumed their work and continued till 6 o'clock, the whole working time being 9 hours and 40 minutes. This arrangement only applied to London, and the two intervals of 20 minutes and half an hour, allowed to enable the men to get beer in the morning and afternoon, were not permitted to the men of any of the provincial ports. The prosecutors found that such frequent intervals of cessation from labour were a great hindrance to business, and that, in addition to this, they really did the men themselves no good, as there was not sufficient time for them to go to their own homes to get refreshment with their families, and, consequently, they were compelled to resort to the public-house. The prosecutors, therefore, thought that an alteration might be made in the arrangement of the periods of labour, which would be beneficial to all parties, and that the two periods of cessation might be abolished, without, however, reducing in the aggregate the amount of time allowed for the cessation from labour. The alteration they pro-

posed consisted in this—that an hour, instead of half an hour, was allowed for breakfast, and the men left off work at half-past 5 instead of 6 P.M.; the intervals allowed for beer in the morning and afternoon were abolished, the result being that the period of work was only nine hours and a-half, instead of 9 hours and 40 minutes, and the broken intervals were done away with. The union of which the defendants were members thought proper, however, to treat this proceeding as an exercise of tyrannical authority, and they determined to resist it. The prosecutors gave notice that the alteration should commence on the 3rd of May, but the period was postponed until the 17th. On the 3rd, however, the whole of the men struck. The prosecutors were very much inconvenienced by this proceeding; they appealed to the men, and offered to refer the matter to arbitration, but the union would not consent to any arrangement. Now commenced the process of intimidation. The men hired a room at a public-house opposite the gate of the prosecutors' factory, whence they had an opportunity of overlooking the factory and seeing everything that took place in it. The prosecutors endeavoured to obtain fresh hands in London, but in this they were foiled through the exertions of the union; they then attempted to obtain men in Wales, at Gloucester, Southampton, Jersey, and other places, but, in several instances where men had agreed to accept employment in the prosecutors' establishment, some of the defendants intercepted them, and induced them to break their engagement. At length Messrs. Young succeeded in obtaining a number of men from

Jersey and other places; but these new hands were immediately subjected to a course of intimidation on the part of the defendants and others connected with the union. They were watched when they left the premises, and followed and threatened, and a crowd of idle and disorderly persons assembled every day, and the greatest possible excitement was created, and language was made use of calculated to create the strongest possible feelings of prejudice against the prosecutors; and at times this state of things prevailed to such an extent as to put a complete stop to business, compelling them to apply for the assistance of the police. The climax of these disorderly proceedings appeared to have been reached on the 26th of July, for on that day a very large number of persons assembled, there was a complete riot, and several of the men who were employed by the prosecutors were severely assaulted. Several of the defendants took part in this proceeding, and did all in their power to obstruct the workmen and intimidate them from going on with their employment. In the course of the proceedings one of the prosecutors was himself assaulted; and they ultimately found it necessary to institute the present proceedings for their own protection.

The evidence for the prosecution fully established the lawless proceedings of the unionists; and, on the advice of their counsel, the prisoners retracted their plea of "not guilty" and admitted their offence. Under these circumstances Baron Bramwell was content to order them to put in recognizances to appear to receive judgment when called upon. With respect to Fredericks, against whom no

evidence was offered, a verdict of *Not Guilty* was taken.

26. FIVE MEN SUFFOCATED.—A shocking accident happened at Williams's distillery at Worcester, by which five men were in a moment hurried into eternity. On Friday afternoon a large waste charger or vat, capable of holding some 10,000 or 15,000 gallons of spirit, had been emptied, and was about to be cleaned. The excise supervisor entered the vat about three o'clock, for the purpose of examining it, and although he found the air, as is usual, oppressive in it, there was nothing to excite alarm. He remained in the vat, which is about twelve feet deep, and of the same diameter, for a few minutes, when he again ascended, and the men proceeded to cleanse it by pouring into it, by means of pipes, a large quantity of water—nearly 1000 gallons, it is surmised—and this was dispersed around the vessel by means of a "rouser," applied through a large orifice at the top—the same through which the supervisor had descended. About twenty minutes after this liquor had been run off, a man named John Drew descended without a light to assist in the cleansing, sufficient light being given from the hole at the top. He was soon observed by a fellow-labourer to be struggling at the bottom. He immediately entered, and was followed by two others—all of them were instantly suffocated, and fell to the bottom of the vat. At this juncture another workman was about descending, and had partially entered the aperture, when he detected a strong smell of carbonic acid gas, and instantly withdrew, at the same time cautioning a young man, who was also prepared to

enter, against doing so. He, however, disregarded his advice, and also fell a victim. A considerable time elapsed before the deadly air could be dispersed from the vat, and when the bodies of the unfortunate men were got out, life was quite extinct.

26. MURDER AT SPIKE ISLAND.—Another assassination has occurred in a gaol. At the convict depôt on Spike Island, a turnkey named Reddy, a man of excellent character, had, in the discharge of his duty, to report a convict named Power for misbehaviour, for which punishment was awarded by the governor. This excited feelings of the deepest resentment in the mind of Power, who resolved on revenge. Between 7 and 8 o'clock, the time for closing the cells, Reddy visited all of them, and among them inspected that in which Power and two other convicts were confined. He was in the act of extinguishing the light, his back being turned to the convicts, when Power came behind him, and with a piece of iron, a portion of his bedstead, struck the unfortunate man a violent blow on the head. Reddy staggered and fell, bleeding profusely. The blow had fractured the skull, and life would, even were no other blow struck, have soon been extinct; but while the victim was lying on the ground, another convict, a man named Norris, came over and struck him. Before any assistance could arrive Reddy had breathed his last. The blow inflicted by Power had fractured the skull immediately above the ear, and had nearly severed the ear from the head.

26. POISONINGS BY MISTAKE.—Two deaths, arising from carelessness or inefficiency of persons entrusted with the sale of poisonous

ingredients, have occurred during the course of the month. The person whose life was sacrificed in the first of these instances was a son of Colonel Broughton, residing at Powell Villa, near Weymouth. About noon on the 11th September the deceased complained of a slight headache, in consequence of which his mother despatched a servant to the shop of Mr. Bailey, a chemist at Weymouth, with a note, requesting "an aperient draught for a child 11 years old." The chemist himself was absent at the time, but one of his assistants, on receipt of the note, directed a lad of about 13 years, who was employed in the shop, to get the "black draught." From some misapprehension the boy, instead of getting the "black draught," put up the same quantity of "black drop," a compound the chief ingredient in which appeared to be opium. The "black drop" was then given to the servant, and in due course administered to the little boy. Shortly after he had taken it the child became comatose, and the parents becoming alarmed sent for medical assistance. This proved unavailing, for the poor boy died shortly after the arrival of the medical man.

An inquest was held, and the jury found that the deceased came to his death from mistake, and appended to their verdict the expression of their disapprobation of the practice of allowing young persons in the employ of chemists to dispense medicine before they are properly qualified by experience to do so.

The other instance occurred at Wadworth, near Doncaster, on the 24th instant, when a poor child met his death in a similar manner. It appeared at the inquest which

was subsequently held, that the mother of the boy went to a small shop in the village, and inquired for a pennyworth of "paregoric," instead of which she was supplied with laudanum, and this being administered to the child caused its death. A verdict in accordance with these facts was returned, the jury also expressing their dissatisfaction at the loose and incautious manner in which the laudanum was dispensed.

In consequence of the numerous instances of death under similar circumstances, and of the dreadful revelations of death by poisons intentionally administered, an Act has been passed by which the sale of poisonous drugs and dangerous compounds will be much restricted.

30. DEATH OF THE BARON DE ROBECK. — The friends of this nobleman, so well known for his scientific attainments, were thrown into a state of the most distressing perplexity by his sudden disappearance on the evening of the 30th instant. He was then resident at Leixli Castle, about eight or nine miles distant from Dublin. On the day in question, he had, in company with his son, twice walked to the Fall of the Salmon Leap, in the Liffey, which runs through the grounds, and at each visit had strongly expressed his admiration of the Fall, which, in consequence of the greatest flood that had been known in the river for years, presented an unusually magnificent spectacle. During the course of the evening, he expressed a desire to re-visit the Fall, but on account of the dampness of the air he was dissuaded from doing so by his son, who shortly afterwards left him in the drawing-room of the Castle.

On his son's return, the Baron

was nowhere to be found, and, consequently, a search was set on foot; but for some time proved fruitless. The gate-keeper on being questioned declared that the Baron had not passed out through the gate, and as the grounds of the Castle were surrounded by a high wall in every other direction, suspicion was directed towards the river. This was confirmed by the statement of a girl, who observed him during the evening standing on the brink of the river and gazing at the Fall for several minutes. She then saw him turn away to ascend the steep bank rising from the river, in doing which he was hidden from her view by a brake of bushes; after which she saw him no more. A further discovery of the Baron's handkerchief in a weir a considerable distance down the Liffey, tended to show that the suspicions entertained were well founded. The river was accordingly dragged, but, notwithstanding every care was taken in the process, the body was not found until the 11th of October. During the previous walks of the Baron to the Fall, he had been assisted by his son up the steep bank where he was last seen, and the probability appeared to be, that, wanting that assistance on his last visit, he slipped down, and, being very feeble, could not recover himself until he rolled into the stream, and was carried away by the current. In this opinion the jury, at the inquest, seemed to concur, by the verdict they gave.

THE WEATHER. — The summer of 1856 may be said to have been a hot one; for while the month of July was of average temperature, the heat in August was very great. On the other hand, September was

rather below the average. On the whole summer quarter the temperature was much the same as the average of the last fifteen years. The highest readings of the thermometer were at Bicester and Worcester 95°. Wheat was cut at Patricxbourn, Helston, Newport, Bicester, Hartwell, and Cardington, between the 1st and 3rd of August. Barley and oats at Helston on the 2nd August. In 1855, wheat was cut at Ryde on the 14th July; and at Nottingham on the 20th; but at Helston not until the 7th of August, and at Bicester until the 8th. Barley and oats varied in the same singular manner.

OCTOBER.

1. INUNDATION OF THE BRYNMALLY MINES.—An accident of an unusual character occurred at the Brynmally coal-mines, about two miles from Wrexham. These pits are very extensive, and a large number of men—from 200 to 300—are employed in them. Some of the old workings have been exhausted and closed up. These closed excavations appear to have acted as vast reservoirs, in which water had accumulated. This morning, while the men were at work, one of the partitions gave way, and an immense body of water rushed in upon them. The men hurried to the higher levels, which most of them reached, though many had to traverse large spaces, with the water rising to their waists. These men were safe; but some in their terror are supposed to have fled to workings from which there is no egress except passages which were immediately closed up by the inundation, and here pro-

bably perished by suffocation, and by a more lingering death by starvation. Thirteen unfortunates are missing. Twenty-five ponies were drowned. How large was the quantity of water accumulated in the old workings may be guessed from the fact that the active workings extend over six acres, all of which were filled. Some weeks must elapse before the water can be got out, to the great expense of the proprietors, and the great loss of the families thrown out of work.

9. FATAL ACCIDENT AT SHEERNESS GARRISON.—No. 6 Company, 6th battalion, of the Royal Artillery, commanded by Captain Elgee, were at garrison gun practice from No. 2 bastion, immediately behind the expense magazine, when a gun exploded. Such was the force of the explosion that a part of the breech of the gun was found close down to the magazine, the right trunnion and other parts of the breech falling on the works. The quoin was split in two pieces, both cheeks of the carriage were blown outward and shattered to pieces, the fore transom was blown out, the left side of the breech of the gun was blown into the breast-work steps, a distance from 10 to 15 yards; the breech and button were blown across the approach, a distance of 30 yards. Each trunnion was blown in opposite directions, to a distance of from 40 to 50 yards. The gunner who fired the gun, was cut partly through the body, between the hips and the knees, and killed. A bombadier had both legs and feet broken and mutilated, and the other men received severe injuries. The gun was fired at an elevation of 3 deg., with a 10lb. charge of powder, the range being 1300 yards. It was a 32-pounder, and weighed 56 cwt.

12. EARTHQUAKE IN THE MEDITERRANEAN.—An earthquake, extensive in its operation and destructive in its effects, has been felt on the islands and eastern shores of the Mediterranean.

On Sunday, the 12th of October, at 11 minutes before 2 A.M., the islands of Malta and Gozo were visited by two shocks of an earthquake, very violent in their nature, and long in their duration. The first shock began with a tremulous motion similar to that caused by the passing of a heavy gun-carriage, magnified a thousand times, and accompanied by a rumbling noise as of distant thunder, which rapidly increased in violence, until every building shook and trembled. Scarcely a minute had elapsed when a second and still more violent shock, accompanied by a louder noise, occurred. The alarm occasioned was general throughout town and country. The sentry at the Treasury left his post and ran to the main guard, which he turned out, under the impression that shells were being thrown into the town by an enemy from some steam-fleet. The two shocks, the interval between being so brief as to be incalculable, lasted fully two minutes. In the city of Valetta scarcely a building escaped injury, and all the structures at the corners of the streets have more particularly suffered. The steeple of Queen Adelaide's Church was shaken, and of the Roman Catholic churches in Valetta, those of San Giacomo, St. Orsola, and St. Domenico appear to have suffered most. The convulsion was most severely felt along the north front of the island, the forts on that coast having been much shaken, while those on the south sea-board experienced the shocks in a much slighter degree. At Floriana and

in each of the three cities, as well as in the harbour, the shocks were felt with considerable vigour, and at Senglea, Conspicua, and Vittoriosa, many of the buildings are injured. Persons on board ships in the port describe the effect of the earthquake, as felt by them, as of letting-go the ship's boats from the davits by the run, only much stronger. The sea receded two feet and a half. At Citta Vecchia, and in the interior of the island, the shocks made themselves felt severely, all the churches, monasteries, nunneries, and hospitals (the Church of St. Augustine excepted), having sustained greater or less damage. The dome of the Cathedral was rent, so as to admit the light, and the belfry was much shaken. The motion of the shocks was by no means uniform. At the outbreak it heaved the ground perpendicularly upwards, and afterwards rolled it from side to side in the direction of due S.E. and N.W. Sentries report a great red glare in the heavens to have preceded the earthquake. At the commencement of the shocks the thermometer stood at about 74°, and the barometer at 30.21; there was a slight fall in both shortly after. No loss of life is reported.

The shock was felt all over Sicily, but appears to have been more severe in the central parts of the island than on the coast. It extended to Naples, and the southern extremity of Italy; to Corfu, and the Greek cities. At Rhodes, which has so frequently suffered before, the effects were again disastrous; towers and buildings were thrown down, and many lives are said to have been lost at Trianda, a village in the interior. In the other Greek islands many persons are said to have perished.

At Thyra, the fallen buildings took fire, and 276 shops, 2 mosques, and other buildings, were destroyed.

The full effect of the visitation appears to have been felt in the island of Candia (Crete). The towns and villages throughout the island were thrown down, and in many instances destroyed by fire, and a vast number of lives were lost. The chief city, Canea, was almost totally destroyed. In the whole island nearly 4000 houses were destroyed, and 1600 persons are said to have perished.

The shock was felt at Alexandria, Beyrout, Aidin, and other places in Asia; but does not appear to have been severe in any part of the continent.

16. HIGHWAY ROBBERY AND MURDER.—A highway robbery, accompanied with murderous violence, was perpetrated at Thryberg, near Rotherham: the victim of the outrage was Mr. Whittaker, farmer and cattle-dealer, about 49 years of age, and one of the leading farmers of the district. He had been at York fair, where he had made some purchases, but had about 180*l.* in notes remaining in his pocket-book. He had instructed his servant to meet him with his gig at Swinton station in the afternoon, but appears to have missed his train, and did not return until the arrival of the mail at Masborough at 11 p.m. He rode on the omnibus to Rotherham, but finding all the inns closed, started to walk home on foot. Thryberg is about three miles from Rotherham, and on the way is a little hamlet, called Dalton Brook, where there are a few cottages, a windmill, a public-house, and a blacksmith's shop. Mr. Whittaker had just passed the latter, when he heard voices behind, and on turning round, he

saw four men issuing from the back of the shop. Suspecting that they meant to rob him, Mr. Whittaker turned round with the intention of getting back to the public-house, but the men immediately set upon him, threw him on the ground, and beat him with two heavy bludgeons, one loaded with lead, and the other pointed with a square piece of iron with sharp edges; rifled his pockets, and covering him up with his two overcoats, ran off towards Dalton Lane. The unfortunate man was so much injured, as to be unable to speak; but he retained perfect possession of his senses, and was able to write an account of the assault, but unfortunately he could give no description of the ruffians, who have hitherto escaped apprehension. Mr. Whittaker died two days after the attack. The bludgeons were found near the spot covered with blood.

16. BOILER EXPLOSION.—The frequency with which fatal accidents have occurred of late from the explosion of boilers, seem to indicate a necessity for preventive measures, and, in some degree, to justify the recommendation of the jury in one instance, that a Government inspection of steam-engines ought to be instituted. In addition to the lamentable occurrence near Bury, reported under the date of August 29th, an explosion of a steam-boiler took place on the 27th of September, at the Watchet Paper Mills. No great injury appears to have been done to the premises on this occasion, but several of the workmen employed in the mills were seriously injured, and one of them, Richard Oliver, who was the foreman of the works, after lingering for several days in intense agony, ultimately expired on the 3rd of

October. An inquest was held, and from the disclosures then made, it appeared that the boiler was purchased at second-hand, while some doubt was created in the minds of the jurors whether the management of it had been entrusted to a sufficiently competent person.

On the 14th instant, a similar accident happened at Middleborough, in this instance attended with more calamitous results. The scene of the occurrence was the extensive iron works belonging to Messrs. Bolckow and Vaughan, and situated on the banks of the river Tees. It seems that five of the workmen were engaged in testing a locomotive engine, which had been recently undergoing repair. Having lit the fire at 11 A.M., the steam was up about 2 o'clock, or a little after that hour. At that time, Mr. Williamson, the head draughtsman of the establishment, was standing upon the engine, and inquired of one of the assistants what pressure the steam gauge indicated. On receiving the reply, that the index marked 72°, he gave orders to screw the spring balance of the engine down to 100°. This was done, and immediately afterwards the boiler exploded, killing Mr. Williamson, with three of the workmen, on the spot, and severely wounding others. The bodies of those who were killed were shockingly mutilated; in one case so much as almost to defy identification. The person who obeyed the orders given by Mr. Williamson had just finished the task, and was lifting his hand off the balance at the moment the explosion took place. He escaped, however, with no more serious wound than a blow on the head from a piece of the boiler plate.

An inquest was held, and a verdict of *Accidental Death* returned.

18. ATTEMPTED FORGERY. — Another of the many cases of fraud which seem likely to render this year a remarkable one in the annals of the commercial world, has been committed.

The person implicated was Octavius King, a young man respectably connected, and who, in the course of his business, which he carried on as a corn-merchant, in partnership with his brother at Dullingham, near Newmarket, had won the confidence of everybody with whom he had had transactions.

On the 16th of August last, he wrote to the manager of the National Discount Company expressing his desire to do business with the Company, which has been recently formed for the discounting of bills, and proffering references. This led to a correspondence, in the course of which King forwarded a bill for discount to the Company, but which, after inquiries had been made, was declined. On the 15th of October, however, the manager received another letter from King, stating that he had sent another bill for his approval. This bill proved to be drawn by King for 1450*l.* on, and accepted by, the well-known firm of Messrs. Bovill and Co., corn-merchants, of Mark Lane. Amongst the other letters which the same post brought to the manager of the Company was one which he opened without previously looking at the direction. On perusal, he found it to contain a request for the discount of another bill, purporting to be drawn and accepted by the same parties, and for nearly the same amount. He immediately turned to the direction, and found that it

was addressed to the manager of the London Discount Company, London. This was a rival Company in course of formation, and it appears that the Post-Office authorities, not being aware of the existence of the latter Company, had forwarded both letters to the office of the National Discount Company. Struck with the singularity of King's proceedings, the manager instituted inquiries as to the authenticity of the acceptances, which resulted in complete proof that both bills were forgeries.

King was arrested and tried at the Central Criminal Court on the 30th of October, when he pleaded *Guilty*, and was sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment.

19. ACCIDENT AT THE SURREY GARDENS.—A deplorable calamity has occurred at these gardens, exemplifying in a remarkable degree the fatal consequences of the want of presence of mind usually manifested by a crowd when under the influence of a sudden panic. The Royal Surrey Gardens, so well known to Londoners from their childish reminiscences of the zoological collection formerly exhibited there, have lately passed into the hands of a "limited liability" company. Amongst other improvements which have been recently introduced was the erection of a magnificent music-hall for the performance of the Monster Concerts, which, under the regime of Monsieur Jullien, have become so popular in the metropolis. This building is computed to be capable of containing an assemblage of at least 10,000 persons. In the interior are three larger galleries, rising one above the other, access to which is afforded by four circular stone staircases, constructed in the towers

which flank each corner of the building.

On the night of the unfortunate occurrence, the building was engaged by the Rev. Mr. Spurgeon, for the purposes of Divine worship. This gentleman, who is the minister of a dissenting congregation usually assembling at a chapel in Park Street, Southwark, by his vigorous and somewhat theatrical style of address, had become so popular among the lower and middle classes of the transpontine residents, that his congregation was constrained to seek for a larger edifice to accommodate the numbers which thronged to his ministrations. They consequently removed to Exeter Hall in the Strand. But the popularity of their preacher still increasing and even extending itself among the higher ranks of society, they soon experienced the same inconveniences which had driven them from Park Street. To free themselves from these they determined to engage the Surrey Music Hall, and the evening in question was the first occasion on which Divine worship was celebrated there. The hour for service to commence was fixed for 6.30 P.M., but long before that period such numbers had collected that Mr. Superintendent Lund, who was in attendance, calculating that there were about 7000 persons already in the area and galleries, gave orders to close the gates. The service commenced; but it had not proceeded beyond a quarter of an hour when some persons in the body of the hall were seen to rise, and one of them, after some little confusion, was heard to call out "fire!" This proceeding alarmed those in the immediate neighbourhood, and from them the panic

spread throughout the whole congregation, who, without waiting to see whether their fears were well founded, appear to have risen with one accord, and rushed in masses to the places of egress. Those in the body of the building found their escape easy, owing to the numerous outlets which existed. The persons in the first gallery, however, disregarding the other means of descent, ran in a body to the staircase in the north-west tower. On the landing at the top of this staircase they met with the stream of persons who were coming down from the upper galleries. The way speedily became blocked, but as the pressure from behind increased, many of those in front were thrown down, and were either trodden to death or suffocated. In this manner five persons lost their lives, and among them a powerful young man, above six feet in height, who, of all persons present, might have been expected to hold his own in a struggle of the kind. He was found, when the abatement of the alarm enabled the police and officers of the chapel to render aid to the sufferers, lying on his back, with his feet up the stairs and his head doubled in upon his chest. Several women were among those who were injured at the same spot. In spite of these accidents, and the entreaties and cries of the wounded, the crowd still continued to struggle onwards until the balustrades of the staircase gave way; and through the aperture thus made several persons were precipitated, while others threw themselves off, receiving severe injuries. No loss of life occurred, however, by this means. An affecting instance of maternal devotion was here exhi-

bited. A young married woman and her husband found themselves with their little boy, jammed up on the staircase. The mother stood nearest the balustrade, and in order to save her child from the pressure she held him over the railing by the collar of his coat. When the balustrade gave way, her husband put his arm round her to prevent her being forced over, and in so doing discovered that she had died while thus saving the life of her son. After the balustrade gave way the pressure in the staircase diminished, and the groundlessness of the alarm being by that time universally discovered, the officers prevailed upon the crowd to return into the galleries. The dead were then collected, and assistance rendered to the injured and the wounded. The former were found to amount to seven in number, the majority being females. On one of them the Cæsarean operation was performed, though without success, as the child was already dead. An inquest was subsequently held, but no satisfactory evidence as to the origin of the cry of fire being given, or any light thrown on the motives of those who first commenced it, a verdict of accidental death was returned.

26. MURDER OF A CHILD AT DOVER.—The inhabitants of Dover had scarcely recovered the shock of the double murder by Redanies, and the murder of the soldier by his comrade [see December 19] when they were again startled by a child-murder under painful circumstances. The unfortunate murderess was a young woman of industrious habits and respectable demeanour, who obtained a living as a laundress. She had, however,

a child about five years old, and this child was not only illegitimate, but its father was the husband of her sister. This disgraceful fact appears to have been kept profoundly secret—the sister was altogether unaware of the criminal intercourse that had taken place; and it appears probable that the terror of discovery haunted the wretched woman's mind, and produced a degree of insanity. Some months since the woman, whose name is Frances Wallace, had formed an intimacy with a young man named Bligh; in whom she put so much trust that she told him the secret of her dishonour. No sooner had this communication been made than the terror seized her mind that Bligh was about to inform her sister of the shameful fact; and possibly Bligh may have used some expressions to that effect. This dread of the discovery appears to have driven the unhappy woman to frenzy; and Bligh having said something about going to London, where the sister and husband reside, she became impressed with the idea that it was for the purpose of making the dreaded disclosure. Of the circumstances of the murder little is known. On the morning of the 26th the murderess went over to a neighbour, who, as she approached, perceived that her hands were covered with blood. She asked her what she had been doing to her hand. The miserable woman replied, "I have been and murdered my own child—go in and look." Upon entering the house, the neighbours found the child lying on the floor with its head nearly severed from the body. When the murderess was taken into custody she did not deny her crime, but used expressions indicative of

a passionate regard for her child, whom she seems to have destroyed in a moment of frenzy induced by apprehensions of the consequence of the discovery of her criminality. She appears to have been most affectionately attached to the child, and to have passed the previous evening in the tenderest endearment. She was tried for the murder at the Maidstone Assizes.

26. EXTRAORDINARY ROBBERY.—A most daring and singular felony has been committed at the Cambridgeshire Lunatic Asylum works, at Fulbourn, about three miles from Cambridge. Upon laying the corner-stone of this building on the 30th of September last, a glass cylinder, containing one of each of the current coins of the realm, with a vellum scroll, on which was written the names of the committee of visitors and officers, was placed in a receptacle hollowed out of a large stone, upon which the corner-stone, bearing an appropriate inscription, and weighing at least half a ton, was placed. This was further secured by the brickwork and masonry surrounding and built over it. This morning, however, it was discovered that two courses of the brickwork above the corner-stone had been removed, and supports placed to shore up the remainder, while the corner stone had been forcibly lifted out of its place by the means of a lever. Brickwork was then placed under it, so that a man's hand and arm might be got into the receptacle of the lower stone containing the coins, which were found to have been abstracted. The value of the coins was 2*l.* 1*s.* 8*d.*; but the mischief done by the robbers, who have escaped detection, amounts to between 20*l.* and 30*l.*

27, DREADFUL EXPLOSION AT

CARDIFF.—About half-past five o'clock this morning a most tremendous explosion of coal took place on board the Norwegian bark *Frederick Retzbaff*, of about 500 tons, Captain Dübell, lying in the West Bute Docks, Cardiff. The decks of the ship were literally rent in pieces, the beam timbers were blown out, the mizenmast was split up, the foretopmast broken, the ratlines and other ropes carried away, and altogether the vessel presented such a mutilated appearance as is seldom witnessed. The heavy and massive coaltip, capable of throwing in six tons of coal at a time, was smashed to pieces, the large iron bolts and supports being snapped like a piece of small wire. Many houses and shops had their windows broken.

The explosion appears to have been caused by the inadvertence of one of the coal-trimmers, who went into the hold of the vessel with a naked candle in his hand, for the purpose of procuring a shovel, which he had left there on a preceding day. The crew of the vessel, amounting to fourteen in all, were thrown by the violence of the explosion out of their berths, either on to the deck or ashore. Three or four were killed, and the remainder received severe injury. The vessel was only four months old, and this was her first voyage. She was very strongly built of oak, and was insured for 7000*l*.

29. A DENSE FOG.—Several accidents occurred in consequence of a thick fog, which prevailed over the metropolis and the surrounding districts. Whilst a goods train was descending an incline near the Wolverton Station, on the London and North-Western Railway, the engine became disconnected, and

ran on in advance of the train for some distance. On discovering this, the engine-driver reversed his engine, but miscalculating the momentum of the advancing train, ran into the engine with great violence. The result was a complete smash of the waggons, and a dislocation of both the up and down lines, causing a complete stoppage of the traffic. Several persons were injured, but no loss of life ensued.

Some conception may be formed of the interruption occasioned to the traffic, when it is stated that at one time during the night there were no fewer than nine passenger trains detained on the up line, and thirteen or fourteen coal and goods trains, while on the down line there were seven passenger trains and twenty-two coal and goods trains stopped at Wolverton.

The down line was cleared about midnight, or nine hours after the accident, but the up line was not in a state to admit of the traffic being resumed until one o'clock on the next day.

Another accident occurred at the Wimbledon Railway Station, where a signal-man was knocked down by a train and killed.

A third happened at the Plough Lane Crossing, Battersea, where the gatekeeper was run over and killed, while letting a person through the gate.

30. ACCIDENT ON THE GREENWICH RAILWAY.—An alarming, but happily not fatal, accident, took place on this line of railway. An up and a down train met on the same rails, and a very violent shock ensued. It happened to take place, however, on a part of the line where it is never customary to have the steam up, and the drivers foresaw it in time con-

siderably to reduce the slow rate at which their respective trains were going at the time; otherwise, the accident, happening under such uncommonly perilous circumstances, must have had more serious results. As it was, seven unfortunate people were conveyed to the hospital considerably injured. Strange to say, not a single carriage, engine, or tender, was thrown off the line, or materially damaged. The fireman of the up train took a desperate leap for life off the engine, over the parapet into the street below; a depth of 30 feet. Of course he was greatly disabled. The accident was caused by the self-acting points being out of order, and not sending the up train onto the other line.

31. TRIAL FOR FORGERY.—*Central Criminal Court.*—William Salt Hardwicke, aged 62, a person of very gentlemanly appearance, and Henry Attwell, aged 24, were indicted for forging and uttering an order for the payment of 410*l.* 7*s.* 4*d.*, with intent to defraud Messrs. Gosling and Sharpe, the bankers.

The accused in this case were part of the great gang of forgers, of which "Saward, the Barrister," otherwise "Jem, the Penman," was the head.

The counsel for the Crown said that this case presented the most deliberate and elaborate arrangement to commit the crime of forgery that had ever, perhaps, been brought to the notice of a court of justice, and the art that had been exhibited by the prisoners was of the most extraordinary kind. It appeared that, in the commencement of the present year, a solicitor, named Turner, who resides in Red Lion Square, lost his pocket-book, which con-

tained a blank check and some letters. Shortly afterwards the prisoner Attwell called at his office, and instructed him to make an application to a person named Hest for a debt of 38*l.* upon an I O U, which he produced. Mr. Turner wrote accordingly to the address indicated, and a few days afterwards a stranger called, and paid the amount desired, and also 6*s.* 8*d.* for the letter. The object of this proceeding evidently was to obtain the signature of Mr. Turner to a check; but on this occasion the parties were foiled, for when Attwell called for his money there happened to be sufficient cash in the office to pay the amount, so that no check was necessary. Very soon afterwards, however, Attwell went to Mr. Turner's office with another I O U for 103*l.* 18*s.* 6*d.*, and again the same proceeding was taken at his request. A letter was written, and very shortly the money was paid, and this time Attwell received a check. A forged check, in the name of Mr. Turner, was then drawn for 410*l.* 7*s.* 4*d.*, and a young man who had advertised for a situation was employed by a person, no doubt in confederacy with the prisoners, to go to the banker's to present it. The prisoner Hardwicke was in the bank at the time he arrived, for the purpose, no doubt, of seeing if all was right, and made some inquiries of the clerk to whom the check was presented, with the object of distracting his attention. The clerk paid the check in eight 50*l.* notes and gold. The prisoners' subsequent proceedings were of the most artful character. The mode they adopted to get rid of the 50*l.* notes was this:—The wife of the prisoner Hardwicke went to the

Temple Bar branch of the Union Bank of London, and expressed a desire to transmit the sum of 20*l*. to a Mr. Richard Gurney, at Hamburg. The money was taken, and she was told that the Hamburg agent of the bank would be advised to pay the amount to Mr. Gurney upon his applying for it. Very soon afterwards both the prisoners made their appearance at the banker's at Hamburg, and the prisoner Hardwicke represented his name to be Gurney, and claimed the 20*l*.; and, taking advantage of the introduction thus afforded them, they asked for change for Bank of England notes, and obtained gold for the whole of the eight 50*l*. notes that were the produce of the forged check. By this proceeding all clue to the authors of the forgery was destroyed, and the prisoners would probably have escaped detection, so far as this case was concerned, but for their subsequent extraordinary proceedings. It seems that in the month of September both the prisoners made their appearance in Yarmouth, Hardwicke representing his name to be Ralph, and that he was a man of fortune, giving a colour to this story by opening an account with one or two banks, and looking at several estates, which he said he intended to purchase, and the other prisoner passing by the name of Attwood. The same course of proceeding was adopted at Yarmouth that had been so successful in London and other places; and Attwell applied to no less than three solicitors, and gave them instructions to write to persons in London for debts that he alleged to be due to him, and in every instance the money was in due course remitted. The prisoners did not succeed, however, in effect-

ing a single forgery, for it happened singularly enough, that the three gentlemen who had been applied to met by accident, and the circumstances of the different applications that had been made to them by Attwell being mentioned, suspicion was at once excited, and they communicated with Mr. Mullens, the solicitor to the Bankers' Association, and he at once proceeded to Yarmouth, when the whole fraud was discovered, and the prisoners were taken into custody. Upon searching the lodging of Attwell, a great many documents were found, clearly showing the share he had taken in the transaction; and, upon searching the house occupied by the other prisoner, there were found a 1000*l*. Exchequer Bill, a revolver pistol, and papers that left no doubt of his being the principal agent in the plan of fraud that had been so successfully and extensively carried out.

The jury immediately returned a verdict of *Guilty* against both prisoners, who were sentenced to be transported for life.

It was stated to the Court that there was another indictment against the prisoner Hardwicke for forging an acceptance to a bill of exchange for 1000*l*., and that he had so nearly obtained the money that the clerk at the bank had the notes in his hand to pay them, when the largeness of the amount induced him to look at the acceptance a second time more closely; he showed it to another clerk, and the forgery was detected.

NOVEMBER.

1. THE CRYSTAL PALACE FRAUDS.—*Central Criminal Court.*

—William James Robson, aged 35, described as a clerk, was placed at the bar to take his trial upon several indictments for larceny and forgery upon the Crystal Palace Company. Upon being placed at the bar the prisoner withdrew his plea of *Not Guilty* to the indictments charging him with larceny as a servant, and pleaded *Guilty*.

The prisoner was then put on his trial upon an indictment which alleged that he had feloniously forged a transfer of a number of shares in the Crystal Palace Company, with intent to defraud Henry Johnson. He was also charged with uttering the same instrument knowing it to be forged.

Mr. Serjeant Ballantine said that, although the prisoner at the bar had pleaded guilty to three indictments involving the offence of having committed larceny upon the property of his employers, it would be his duty to state the circumstances connected with the present case, with the view of putting the jury and the Court in possession of the mode in which the frauds committed by the prisoner at the bar were effected, and of allowing all the matters, so far as they were within the knowledge of those who instructed him, to be fully and perfectly known. Under the charter of incorporation of the Crystal Palace Company the directors were entitled to issue a certain number of shares, and they were also enabled, under certain circumstances, to apply for power to issue a certain number of other shares. The prisoner at the bar was a young man of great intelligence and considerable powers of mind, and possessed of an education very much beyond

the rank of life to which he originally belonged. He was a clerk at a salary of 1*l.* a week when he originally attracted the notice of the managers of the Crystal Palace Company. He was one of those persons of whom there were many in this country—men who, if they were honest and straightforward in their conduct, might, with the opportunities given them in this great commercial country, rise, as many had risen, to the highest positions in it. The prisoner at the bar, however, having those opportunities, possessing those talents, and having an entrance into life which most persons would have grasped at with avidity, was not content with a fair course of honest industry, but sought to obtain wealth speedily, and was betrayed from fraud to fraud until he now stood at the bar a felon, convicted on his own confession, and on his trial for one of the gravest offences against property known to the law. Shortly after the prisoner's connection with the Crystal Palace he was promoted to a higher appointment, and his salary was raised to 100*l.* a year. He was subsequently promoted to a still higher situation—chief clerk of the transfer department—with a salary of 150*l.* a year, and was placed under the immediate direction of Mr. Fasson, who was looked to as the head of the department. Owing, however, to Mr. Fasson at that time being in feeble health and suffering a good deal, and finding the prisoner to be a person of intelligence and ability, and believing him to be also a man of honour and integrity, a great portion of the business of the office of which Mr. Fasson was at the head was left in the hands of the prisoner, and

opportunities were afforded to the prisoner of which he availed himself. The mode in which the shares of the company were issued from time to time was as follows : —There was kept in the office of which the prisoner was a clerk a book containing a register of the shareholders of the company, and every person possessing shares in that company had a right to have his name placed on that register. If a shareholder's name were not registered it could only be by his own neglect. This register was evidence to the company of the title of the persons upon it ; but to the public at large and the parties themselves the company were compelled by their deed to issue certificates to show what the title was, and these certificates, if possessed by others, would give an apparent title in the eyes of the public to a transfer of shares. But inasmuch as the certificates given showed the names of the real persons on the register, no parties who chose to make proper inquiry could by possibility be defrauded, or could be induced to part with their money without a proper transfer. In all the business of life, if men were careless and took things as a mere matter of course, it was easy for designing persons to effect frauds, and those who were defrauded in such cases were too apt to blame others instead of blaming their own carelessness. That had been done to a considerable extent with regard to these frauds ; but when he explained to the jury the mode in which these transfers had taken place, they would see that every human means had been taken by the directors to prevent any party being defrauded, and that no persons need have been defrauded if they had only taken

those precautions which every man, before he parted with his money, was bound in justice to himself and to the public at large to take. The certificates, as he had explained, would show the names of the persons appearing upon the register. Now, it appeared that the prisoner had these certificates in his possession—for many people possessing shares and being really on the register, instead of taking their own certificates and locking them up in their strong-box, allowed them to remain in the custody of the company. Any person having these certificates in his possession was enabled to exhibit an apparent title to the shares in the market. The prisoner knew, of course, the names of the persons appearing on the register ; but if he had used any of the names placed on the register, and had sold or transferred those shares, and the parties had applied for dividends, the frauds would have been detected. The prisoner at the bar adopted another mode of operation. Having the certificate he went to the broker's and offered to transfer the shares. He did not, however, use the name of any person appearing on the register or on the certificate, but used some other name—in the present case it was Johnson—and offering to transfer the shares from Johnson to any purchaser whom the broker might discover. If, when the application was made, the broker had looked at the certificate as it was his duty to have done, he would have seen that Johnson had no power or right to transfer, unless there had been a previous transfer to Johnson. He ought to have said, “on this certificate Johnson's name does not appear ; there is some other name

before." But the truth was that the matter was done most loosely, and it was assumed that some person might have transferred the shares to Johnson, and that Johnson had a right to transfer them to some one else. The broker therefore sold the shares and accepted the transfer, although Johnson, a relative of the prisoner, living at Birmingham, never had a share in the Crystal Palace in his life, and his name was only used for the purpose of effecting the fraud. The transfer was a forgery, and he would call Johnson to prove that it was not signed by him, and that the prisoner attested the signature of Johnson to the transfer, well knowing it to be a forgery. A great deal of error had prevailed in the public mind on the subject, but he had stated the nature of the precautions taken by the company to prevent frauds, and he would call their attention to the fact that a man acting with common prudence could not have been defrauded by a transaction of this kind. It was the wish of the company that everything in which they had any dealings should be fully inquired into, and that the public should know that, although the company had been robbed to a great extent, they had endeavoured by every means in their power to prevent that robbery from taking place or the public from being injured by it.

The evidence was, of course, confined to the single charge on which the prisoner was indicted, and the fraud and the system by which it was carried out were distinctly proved. In the case before the jury 100 shares of the company had been sold for 295*l.*, which sum was handed to the

prisoner. The transaction was made in the name of Johnson; the signatures were forged, and were in the handwriting of the prisoner, who had also signed the attestation.

Mr. Fasson stated, that in consequence of something that had come to his knowledge, on the 24th of December last, he had a communication with the prisoner in reference to some certificates that were missing, and he admitted that there had been an irregularity, but said that the certificates were at his own house at Kilburn, and he proposed that witness should accompany him there to obtain them. This conversation took place in witness's private rooms at the Palace, and he believed that Mr. Grove, the secretary, was present. Witness consented to accompany the prisoner to his house, and they proceeded there together. After they had arrived, the prisoner came in and out of the room where witness was two or three times, and appeared to be putting papers together, and the last time he left he did not return; nor did Mr. Fasson see him again until he was placed at the bar of the Lambeth Police Court in October.

It seemed the prisoner had fled to the Continent, and had been hunted from town to town by a "detective" officer, who finally captured him at Copenhagen on the 7th of October.

The person whose name was forged was the prisoner's brother-in-law, and resided at Birmingham. Mr. Johnson admitted that he had had money transactions with the prisoner, but denied that he had given authority to him to use his name in any way whatever. This witness's manner was somewhat hesitating.

The counsel for the prisoner admitted that he had committed the offences to which he had pleaded guilty, and said he must take the severe punishment inflicted for such crimes; but he asserted that he was not guilty of forgery, for if it were true, as the prisoner asserted, that Johnson had given him authority to use his name, the prisoner would not be guilty of forgery in using it as a signature to these transfers, although Johnson might not be in any way cognizant of the purposes for which it was used. The learned counsel said, that the use of feigned names was very common in Stock Exchange transactions—which it is to be feared is very true, and affords great cover for fraud.

The Jury found the prisoner "Guilty," and Mr. Justice Erle sentenced him to 20 years' transportation for the larcenies, and 14 years' for the forgery. These periods are concurrent.

The amount of the prisoner's forgeries and frauds has been ascertained to be about 28,000*l*.

2. LOSS OF THE LYONNAIS.—On the 1st instant, the screw steamer *Le Lyonnais* left New York for Havre: she was an iron vessel. There were 39 cabin passengers on board, and the steerage passengers and crew are estimated at 150 persons. Late at night on the 2nd, some 60 miles from the Nantucket light-ship, the *Lyonnais* was run into by the bark *Adriatic*, bound for Savannah. The after part of the steamer quickly filled with water. The *Adriatic* was little damaged: she continued her course, and put into Gloucester. Her people said they did not know the steamer had suffered much; they thought she continued her course. It was not so. The two

after-compartments of the *Lyonnais* were full of water, but the fore part of the vessel remained out of the water. Attempts were made to save the ship, but they were fruitless. Next day, the people abandoned her in the six boats—only one of them a life-boat—and on a raft which had been constructed. The weather was bad; one boat was swamped, but the people got on the raft. There are contradictory statements as to how the boats were provisioned and provided with instruments. Only one boat has been heard of; it contained the second mate, some passengers, and seamen—18 in all. A passenger and a seaman died from cold. The rest existed in misery till the following Sunday, when they were rescued by the Bremen bark *Elise*.

7. "BIG BEN" OF WESTMINSTER.—At the foot of Westminster Bridge, a structure rises to the height of 300 feet, which has been described as "the grandfather of kitchen clocks," but which is the clock tower of the Palace of Westminster. The bell which is to announce to the assembled legislators and to all who may hear it the passage of time, has arrived at its foot, and has since frequently surprised the most distant inhabitants of the metropolis—north, south, east, or west, as the wind may set, by its unearthly vibration. This great bell, which has been designated "Big Ben," in perpetual memory of Sir Benjamin Hall, during whose presidency as the Chief Commissioner of Works it has been cast, was founded by Messrs. Warner and Sons, of Boston. Its designer is an amateur of scientific repute, who has paid much attention to the theory of bell-founding, Mr. Edmund Beck-

ett Denison, Q.C. The materials of which it is composed are copper and tin, mixed in a proportion which an analysis of the best-toned ancient bells has shown to produce the richest sounds. Its weight is 15 tons 18 cwt. 22 lbs., or nearly 16 tons—much heavier than any of our cathedral Great Toms. It is of beautiful shape. When fairly landed at Westminster, it was suspended on a “cat-gallows” at the foot of the clock tower. Its tone has been tested at uncertain intervals by a very inartificial method. A hammer of 12 cwt. is so placed as to strike the outer rim; this is drawn back by a rope pulled by a gang of labourers, and allowed to fall on the bell. Under these very unpropitious circumstances, the effect of Big Ben is portentous and heart-rending. Sometimes the sound is the undefined murmur of a lamp-shade when a blue-bottle runs his head against it; at others, there is a full, strong, but tremulous vibration, that causes the heart to sink into the boots; and then, sometimes, a rich, full, clear, and satisfactory volume of sound. As bells, like poets and artists, are to be judged by the best and not by the worst of their efforts, it is to be hoped, that when Big Ben has been properly hung, and is struck in an artistic manner, his tones will be always such as these last. The designer proposed that the musical notation of Big Ben should be E natural. To the great satisfaction of all musical theorists, this was the exact note uttered by the monster.

It is stated that Big Ben had a predecessor who, after announcing many of the most striking events in the history of England for four centuries, still survives in a state of transmigration, and has,

for the last two hundred years, announced the decease of monarchs and the hourly passage of time to myriads of sober citizens and gaping rustics, all unconscious of its mystic ancestry.

The famed Great Bell of St. Paul's was, in a previous state of existence, Great Tom of Westminster. It is said, that down to the Revolution, there stood in Old Palace Yard, a handsome clock tower, built in the reign of Edward I., out of a fine imposed on a delinquent Chief Justice. In allusion to this origin, if true, the chief duty of Westminster Tom was to summon the judges and legislators below to their duties, and to warn them of the manner in which they ought to be performed by the motto on its rim, “*Discite justitiam moniti et non temnere divos.*” The tower had fallen into ruin, and after the Revolution, William III. presented the bell to the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, who re-cast it; and it has since that time distributed its rich sound over the vast area of the metropolis from the south-west tower of the great Protestant cathedral.

8. MURDER AT ERITH AND SUICIDE OF THE MURDERER.—A body, which proved to be that of Mr. George Carter, was found at a secluded spot in the immediate vicinity of Erith, under circumstances inducing a suspicion that he had been barbarously murdered.

The murdered man was the son of a market gardener, residing in the neighbourhood of Battersea, and having unluckily come into the possession of some property by his father's death, had been since living an idle life. He was known to be contemplating a voyage to the gold diggings of Australia. On the morning of Saturday, a la-

bourer discovered his dead body in a copse in the grounds of an unoccupied mansion near Erith. The deceased held a carpenter's gouge in his right hand, which at first gave rise to the inference that he had taken away his own life; but a *post-mortem* examination of the body pointed to a far different conclusion. It was found that on the left side of the chest, from the breastbone to the fold of the armpit, were 16 punctured wounds, some being superficial, and others perforated. Eight of these wounds had entered the heart, and any one was sufficient to have caused death. On examining the heart one of these wounds was found to be much larger than the rest, and appeared to have been made by two thrusts with the same instrument. The external wounds and the wounds in the heart corresponded exactly with the shape, size, and form of the carpenter's gouge found in the hand of deceased after death. The contents of the stomach presented appearances of spirituous liquors having been taken immediately before death. Two severe fractures were found on the skull, showing that there had been a violent blow, or blows, on the head. One was three inches long, and extended from the centre of the top of the head to the left temple; the other was on the right side of the head.

Suspicion immediately pointed to a young man named Worrall, a carpenter by trade, with whom Carter was on terms of close intimacy, and in whose company he had been last seen. This Worrall was an idle vagabond, who had been twice to the Australian diggings, and who is supposed to have instigated Carter to try the same adventure.

A cabman now came forward and stated that at 10 in the morning of the 7th he was called off his stand by Worrall, whom he knew, and ordered to drive to Battersea Fields. They called at several public-houses; and ultimately took up Carter, whom the witness did not know, but whose cap and jacket he recognised. He drove them to the London Bridge Station, and saw them proceed in the direction of the North Kent Line. That was about 12 o'clock. At 4 o'clock the same afternoon Worrall again engaged him, and he drove him and a female to the City of London Theatre. Several witnesses had seen Carter and Worrall together in the cab, and their identity was distinctly made out.

Mrs. Elizabeth Perkins, residing at 3, Park Spring Terrace, Erith, stated, that on the Friday in question, just after the arrival of the 1 o'clock train from London, she saw from the back part of her house, which commands a view of the avenue leading to Lesney's Hall, and of the copse in which Carter was subsequently found dead, two men going in the direction of the avenue, one of whom she particularly noticed wore a blue jacket. Having once lived at Battersea, the persons of both Worrall and Carter were known to her. Witness thought one of these persons resembled Carter, who had a peculiar walk.

A witness who had formerly been in the employment of Worrall's father identified the gouge found by the side of Carter's corpse, as one which he had had in his possession, and which he had suddenly missed. Both Carter and Worrall were in the habit of coming to witness's shop, and either might have taken it.

The coroner's jury returned a verdict "That the deceased was wilfully murdered by Thomas Cartwright Worrall."

But before they had arrived at this conclusion, the murderer was no more, and the particulars of his foul crime will remain in mystery.

When the evidence pointed to Worrall as the murderer the police took him into custody. When searched there was found on him, among other things, a letter addressed to his father, in which he strongly asserted his innocence, but expressed his inability to bear the charge of having murdered one whom he loved so well, and his determination to commit suicide. In consequence of this the prisoner was again strictly searched, but nothing was found on him. When locked up in his cell, two constables were appointed to watch him during the night, who visited the cell every five minutes. The last visit thus paid was at a quarter past 1 o'clock, when nothing unusual was observed. At 20 minutes after 1 a police constable entered the cell, and found the prisoner lying on his back quite dead. On the pan of the water-closet in the cell being searched, two small phials were discovered, which had contained prussic acid.

9. ACCIDENTS ON THE EASTERN COUNTIES RAILWAY.—A double accident occurred near the Harling Road Station of the Eastern Counties Railway, from which it is difficult to understand how the passengers escaped with less than total destruction. The parliamentary train from Norwich to Cambridge had reached Thetford in safety. When the Bridgham cutting, about four miles from Thetford, was reached, an unusual knocking noise was heard, and the

driver shut off the steam, applied the brake, and told his "mate" to go round the engine, and see what was the matter. He obeyed the order, but was almost immediately thrown off to the ground with great violence. The tire of the left leading wheel of the engine had broken, and the immense machine, which was being propelled at the rate of 25 or 30 miles an hour, left the rails, and ran along the bank of the cutting for some yards, when it fell over, carrying the tender with it, and throwing it partly across the up-line. The carriages attached in the meantime continued their course, and, the engine being suddenly brought to a standstill, a frightful crash took place, two of four horse-boxes, which were providentially placed next the tender, being smashed to atoms. The shock being thus happily broken, the passengers escaped without much injury; but the driver was crushed to death beneath the engine; his corpse could not be extricated for some hours.

The disaster, however, did not end here. A goods train which was proceeding on the up line came almost immediately afterwards and struck the tender of the fallen engine, which was lying, as has been already stated, partly across the rails. The engine of the goods train and the first two trucks passed the tender safely, but the third truck nearly capsized, and became separated from those which had preceded it. Another of the trucks was also thrown off the rails, and both lines became completely blocked. By great exertion one line of rails was sufficiently cleared to admit of trains being passed over the next morning; the general traffic was closed until the second day.

EXTENSIVE FIRE IN ST. MARTIN'S LANE.—A destructive fire has occurred in Swan Yard, St. Martin's Lane. The building in which this conflagration originated was the extensive premises occupied by Messrs. Almond and Co., army and navy accoutrement makers. It contained no less than nine flats, all of which at the time of the fire were filled with property of a very valuable description. From thence it extended to the Parthenium Club and to the carriage factory of Messrs. Whittingham and Co. Notwithstanding the most arduous exertion of the fire brigade it raged for some hours, nor was it subdued until the premises of some 15 or 20 persons, in addition to those above mentioned, were more or less injured by the flames. The aggregate of damage done was estimated at 20,000*l*.

12. COLLISIONS ON THE NEWPORT AND HEREFORD RAILWAY.—A singular accident occurred near Pontrhydyrun, midway between the Pontypool Junction and Pontnewydd Station, on the Newport, Abergavenny, and Hereford Railway. A line of trucks escaped from the Pontypool station on the Monmouthshire Railway and Canal Company's line, and, as the railway thence towards Newport is on a steep decline, they soon acquired a great momentum. A passenger train was at this moment travelling in the opposite direction. The driver fortunately saw the approaching trucks, and was enabled, before the collision actually took place, to bring his train nearly to a standstill. The force of the collision was therefore much lessened, but much damage was done, and many passengers were hurt. The passenger train was driven back

more than a mile. On the same afternoon a more serious collision on the same line took place near the Nantyberry Station, not far from Abergavenny. The down express from Hereford left the Abergavenny Station about a quarter after 1 o'clock, and had not proceeded far before it came to a sharp curve near the Nantyberry Station. Here the express engine jumped off the line and took a course across the road to the up-line, which it crossed. Just at this critical juncture a goods train came up, and came into contact with the passenger carriages. The engine was thrown upon its side down the embankment, and the train destroyed. Two gentlemen were killed, and several persons were severely injured.

14. MURDER OF A CHILD AT WOKINGHAM.—A murder was perpetrated at Wokingham by a man who was acting as a home missionary in that town. A lady named Saltmarsh, living at Bill Hill, about two miles from the town, anxious for the spiritual improvement of the poor of her neighbourhood, determined upon opening a school-room and employing a person as a home missionary to deliver weekly lectures and sermons to the rural population, and distribute religious tracts among them. She made application to the London City Mission Society, and engaged a person named Charles Forester, who came down to the neighbourhood about a year and a half ago, and entered upon his work. He was a very earnest and active man, and for this reason had obtained the respect of the people; but his intellectual attainments were of too low a caste to make him as useful as desired, and arrangements were made with him to be superseded,

which was done in July last. Being unwell at that time, and having indications of consumption, he succeeded in becoming a patient in the Brompton Consumption Hospital, where he remained for a time. However, he did not reach his home at Embrook, about a mile from Wokingham, until Monday last, when he found that his wife had during his absence opened a shop for the sale of grocery, and was doing comfortably. He was in a very low, desponding state, and continued so until Thursday, when he appeared improved. He retired to rest in much better spirits, and slept more soundly than on any night since his return. On Friday morning Mrs. Forester got up about 7 o'clock, leaving her boy Samuel, aged five years, in bed with his father, and they both appeared to sleep soundly. In about an hour afterwards, when Mrs. Forester was engaged in serving a customer in the shop, her husband came downstairs and walked out of the house. As he did not return, and her child appeared to be sleeping longer than usual, she went upstairs, and, to her horror, found her boy on the bed with his head nearly severed from the neck. The razor with which the deed had been committed was found under the dead body. It appeared that the miserable man had walked straight into the town and given himself into the custody of the police, stating that he had murdered his only child. As his hands were found to be covered with blood, he was detained.

The unhappy man was proved to be quite insane.

14. MYSTERIOUS MURDER AT DUBLIN.—A terrible murder, the perpetrator and circumstances of

which have remained undiscovered, has been committed at Kingstown.

Mr. George Little was the cashier of the Great Western Railway of Ireland, whose principal terminus is at Broadstone, near Kingstown. He was about 40 years of age, unmarried, mild in his manners, and very much trusted and respected.

On the morning of Wednesday, the 14th, Mr. Little did not arrive at his office at the usual hour, and about midday his sister, with whom he resided, came to the office in some alarm because her brother had not come home the previous evening as usual, nor since. Under these circumstances it was thought proper to break open the door of the cashier's office, which was locked. The corpse of Mr Little was discovered stretched on the floor. The body was lying on the face; the throat was cut from ear to ear; and on a surgical examination it was found that the head was covered with wounds, and the skull was fractured in many places—crushed to fragments. No instrument was found in the office by which the wounds could have been inflicted; neither was the key of the door to be found. A towel was marked with blood, and cut, as if the murderer had wiped a sharp instrument upon it. A sum amounting to near 1500*l.* was found ranged in piles on the tables, evidently in form in which Mr. Little had counted them for checking his accounts. They did not appear to have been disturbed, or any portion removed; and it was not until the accounts had been minutely investigated that it was ascertained that between 400*l.* and 500*l.* had been carried off.

When the police had investigated the premises this appeared to be

one of the most mysterious tragedies ever perpetrated. When Mr. Little was engaged in counting the sums remitted to him he was in the habit of locking the door of his room, and would only open it to some well-known voice; the window of the room looked on to the platform, and was nailed down; there was a fixed skylight. The door of the room was locked as usual, but the key was gone. Between the door and Mr. Little's desk was a partition, with a latticed top, such as is frequently seen in counting-houses; it was within this partition and beside his usual stool at the desk that the unfortunate gentleman was found. He had evidently been struck a deadly blow, and had fallen without resistance or further struggle. The instrument with which the blows had been struck, and that with which the throat had been cut, were gone. No indication was left by which to trace the murderer, except some supposed smears of blood on a door-post on the basement story, far distant from the scene of the tragedy. As this door was fastened, and the murderer had not succeeded in opening it, it is supposed that he returned to a window in the corridor which opened on to the platform, which bore some marks as though a person had got out by it.

The murder is supposed to have been committed during the bustle occasioned by the departure of the mail train, about a quarter after 7 P.M. The clerk attending Mr. Little left him about 10 minutes past 5. He was then going through his accounts. A servant girl turned the handle of the door about half-past 5: it was locked, and no one spoke. The same girl declares that soon after 7 o'clock, being in

a room beneath the cashier's office, she distinctly heard Mr. Little's footstep overhead.

The Dublin police were immediately put on the alert, and their efforts proving unavailing, some London detectives were despatched to give their keen wits to the search. Some persons were arrested and detained some time in confinement; but apparently they had nothing to reveal, and they were discharged. The neighbouring canal and reservoir were drained, and the mud carefully searched. A hammer, such as might have struck the heavy blows, and a razor, were found, and appeared to afford a slight clue to the murderer. But the efforts of the police were altogether baffled by the caution of the villain, and the murder of Mr. Little had passed into the category of inscrutable mysteries, when in the following year the excitement of the public was aroused by a communication pointing out distinctly a certain party as the perpetrator of this bloody deed. The terrible circumstances attending this revelation, the circumstantial details of the murder, and the result, belong to the *Chronicle* of next year.

14. IMMENSE FRAUD ON THE GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY.—Another fraud connected with the transfer of shares and stock, but on a far grander scale, and by a much more pretentious criminal, has been discovered.

Of late some strange discrepancies had been observed in the accounts of the Great Northern Railway Company, and in particular that the amount paid for dividends considerably exceeded the rateable proportion to the capital stock. An investigation was directed. The registrar of shares, Mr.

Leopold Redpath, expressed a decided opinion that the investigation into his department would be useless; and, on its being pressed, absconded. The investigation developed a long-continued system of frauds of vast amount: to the amount, it was said, of nearly 250,000*l*.

Mr. Leopold Redpath passed in society as a gentleman of ample means, great taste, and possessed of the Christian virtue of charity in no common degree. He had a house in Chester Terrace handsomely furnished, and a "place" at Weybridge complete with every luxury that wealth could procure; gave good dinners with excellent wines; kept good horses and neat carriages. He was a governor of Christ's Hospital, the St. Ann's Schools, and subscribed freely to the most useful charities of London. His appointment on the Great Northern was worth 300*l*. per annum; but it was supposed that this was only of consequence to Mr. Redpath as affording him a regular occupation, and an opportunity of operating in the share-market, in which he was known to have extensive dealings. The directors of the railway appear to have been perfectly aware that their servant was living far beyond his salary; but they considered him to be a very successful speculator. Upon this splendid bubble being blown up, Redpath fled to Paris; but finding that the French authorities were not inclined to protect him, he returned to London and surrendered himself.

The mode in which this gigantic swindler had committed his frauds is simple enough. Having charge of the books in which the stock of the company is registered, he altered the sum standing in the

name of some *bonâ fide* stockholder to a much larger sum, generally by placing a figure before it, by which simple means 500*l*. became 1500*l*., or 2500*l*., or any larger number of thousands. The surplus stock thus *created* Redpath sold in the stock-market, forging the name of the supposed transferer, transferring the sum to the account of the supposed transferee in the register, and either attesting it himself, or causing it to be attested by a young man, his *protégé* and tool, but who appears to have been free from guilty cognizance. In some instances the fraud was but the more direct course of making a fictitious entry of stock, and then selling it. By these processes the number of shareholders, and the amount of stock on the company's register, became greatly magnified; while, as the *bonâ fide* holders of stock remained credited with their proper investments, there was no occasion for suspicion on their part. How Redpath dealt with subsequent transfers of the fictitious stock does not appear. The prisoner was subjected to repeated examination before the police magistrates, when this prodigious falsification was thoroughly sifted; and the prisoner was finally committed for trial at the Central Criminal Court in the following year. It is said that the value of the leases, furniture, and articles of taste in Redpath's house in Chester Terrace is estimated at 30,000*l*., and at Weybridge at a still larger sum. It is also said that Redpath and Robson, whose forged transfer of Crystal Palace shares has been recorded in this *Chronicle*, were formerly fellow clerks.

19. DREADFUL RAILWAY COLLISION IN IRELAND.—An accident of a most appalling nature, attended

with great loss of life, took place about 2 o'clock P.M. on the Waterford and Kilkenny Railway, at Dunkitt, within a few miles of the first-named city. On this occasion no less than seven persons were killed on the spot, and a large number of the passengers severely wounded. The accident was occasioned by the down mail train from Dublin having run into some ballast waggons, while going at a speed of 40 miles an hour. The shock of such a collision was of course tremendous; the waggons and carriages were literally crushed up together.

The line of railway between Kilkenny and Waterford is single. It is necessary, therefore, that all goods and ballast trains should be run into a siding at Dunkitt, for the purpose of allowing the mail and passenger trains to pass. On the present occasion the ballast train was in the siding, but the "points" leading from the main line to the siding were improperly left open. The mail train came up at full speed, and, in consequence of the "points" being open, diverged from the main line and dashed into the siding, smashing itself and everything before it into atoms. When the collision was seen to be inevitable, the men in the ballast train jumped out and attempted to run up a steep embankment. Several tumbled back again and were caught by the train and cut to atoms. Four had their heads cut completely off, and one, who was the only victim that showed any signs of life after the collision, had his arms cut off.

Human language must fail to accurately describe this appalling picture. Brains, blood, and entrails of men, pieces of carriages and engines, goods and luggage, were everywhere visible, and presented

a scene too horrible for contemplation. The engine-drivers, who fortunately leaped on to the side of the truck where the down train should have passed, escaped almost uninjured. The engine of the down train, with tender and goods waggon, was smashed to atoms, the tender standing on end. One man lay in a ditch on one side of the line, with his skull smashed in, out of which might be seen protruding the unfortunate man's brains. Another lay unconsciously in the truck, with the wheel of the engine through his back, literally cut in two, and having his head completely severed from his body; while a third man might be seen with both arms off. The remaining two men had also their heads severed from their bodies. All those killed were labourers who had come from Thomastown, and were employed in ballasting the line. The passenger carriages of the down train, which contained about 20 persons, fortunately were not mingled with the ruins, but the sudden collision caused great consternation among them. They were dashed about in the greatest confusion, injuring all more or less, and wounding several very seriously.

The coroner's inquest resulted in the following verdict:—

"We find the deceased persons were killed at Dunkitt siding, on the Waterford and Kilkenny Railway, by the Kilkenny midday mail to Waterford coming into collision with the ballast train in such siding, in consequence of the points of the siding having been unlawfully and improperly left open; that such points were in the particular care of Michael Brien, gauger, in charge of the ballast train, who neglected to see them closed. Our finding

is that of Manslaughter against the said Michael Brien, through whose wilful and unlawful neglect the deaths have occurred; that no blame can be attached to any of the officers of the traffic department on the line, whose driver and fireman used every effort in their power to prevent the catastrophe."

26. ADULTERY AND MURDER.—A trial for murder, which had just taken place in Canada at the date of the last advices, seems to have created a very strong feeling in that colony. The facts of the case were shortly these. Mr. Thomas Henderson, an attorney, had been the school-fellow and fellow-pupil of Mr. George Brogdin of Port Hope, also a member of the same profession. Mr. Brogdin had been married for two or three years, and had one child, while Henderson still remained a bachelor. The similarity of their age and pursuits, however, produced a close intimacy between the two gentlemen, which was naturally increased when Henderson came forward as the declared admirer of Mrs. Brogdin's sister. Taking advantage of the opportunities this position afforded him, and forgetful of the ties of friendship, Henderson persuaded Mrs. Brogdin to elope with him, and afterwards boasted in letters to his acquaintance that he had made her his mistress. He also told several persons that he always carried arms, that Brogdin was a poor fool and coward who did not understand the use of them, and that if they chanced to meet it would be the worse for Brogdin. These remarks came to the hearing of Brogdin; indeed, the affair had got into the local newspapers. Some weeks passed over before they met. Notwithstanding the bad conduct of his

wife, arrangements were made by Brogdin, after she went away, to settle an income upon her, giving as a reason that he loved her too well to let her die in a ditch, which she would do if she continued with Henderson. When Henderson heard of this he exclaimed he did not care for anything Brogdin could do after that, because he was perfectly satisfied that such conduct towards her would preclude Brogdin from getting a verdict against him in an action for *crim. con.* On the very next day, September 23, they met accidentally on the steamboat wharf. Henderson nodded insolently to Brogdin, saying, "How d'ye do, George?" Brogdin immediately drew a pistol from his pocket and shot Henderson dead. These were the facts proved in evidence, without contradiction, and the Chief Justice told the jury that he could not imagine "a plainer case of murder." "The law," said his Lordship, "does not admit that Henderson's conduct was any excuse for murder." The jury, however, brought in a verdict of "Not Guilty."

26. EXPLOSION ON BOARD THE MAIL STEAMER PARANA.—A disastrous explosion has taken place on board the West India Mail steamer *Parana*, by which five persons have lost their lives, and several others have suffered injuries.

The vessel was lying in the outer dock, and the steam had been got up for the purpose of testing her boilers, preparatory to her next voyage. The steam had been blown off from three of her four boilers; the fourth was kept charged for the purpose of trying some experiments; the steam, which had shown a pressure of 17 lbs. to the inch, had fallen to 12 lbs. to the inch, and the safety valves were

open, when the boiler exploded with great violence. The immense quantity of coal in the bunkers probably saved the ship from being instantly sunk, but the men employed in the engine-room met the most horrible of deaths—scalding by the heated steam and water. Three coal-trimmers were scalded to death in the stoke-hole, a fourth died in the hospital, another lingered some days, four were seriously injured, and others less dangerously. The inquiry by the coroner's inquest failed to obtain any explanation of the cause of the disaster.

28. THE PARLIAMENT STREET MURDER.—Joseph Jenkins, *alias* Robert Marley, aged 39, surgical instrument maker, was indicted for the wilful murder of Richard Cope.

The crime for which the prisoner was indicted had caused the greatest sensation. The murder was committed in a shop, so small that every passer-by can see the whole of it—in one of the principal thoroughfares, and so placed, that persons within can scarcely speak with full voice without being heard in the street—and at an hour of the evening when the streets are full of passengers.

The prisoner, a tall man of respectable appearance, pleaded "Not Guilty," in a loud voice.

Mr. Frederick Berry.—I am a jeweller, and reside at Stafford Row, Pimlico. My shop is in Parliament Street. It projects beyond the house, and there is no room over it. The shop is not more than $3\frac{1}{2}$ feet deep. The door of the shop swings in two parts, and I generally sat on the left-hand side as people entered, and the deceased worked on the opposite side to me. The counter in the shop is about

two feet wide, but the deceased had nothing before him but a work board, and he was separated from the shop by a glass partition and door. The deceased had been in my service for 10 years. My custom was to have the stock of jewelry packed up every night and put in a secret and secure place. No one slept upon the premises. The deceased and I generally left the shop together, but if I went first he used to bring the keys and a box in a blue bag to my house. If we left together he used to carry the bag and box. This box was empty. I was at the shop on the night of the 20th of October. The stock consisted of watches and jewelry that were exposed in the window for sale. I went away from the shop a few minutes past 8 on the 20th of October, leaving the deceased behind in the usual place where he worked, behind the glass door. I returned to the shop a few minutes past 9 on the same evening, and I then found the deceased on my side of the shop. I stayed about ten or twelve minutes, and when I left the shop was still open and the gas burning, and the deceased had commenced packing up the stock and had put away the watches left to repair. The stock on my side was all in the window and on the counter. I brought a flag basket with me containing a codfish when I came back, and I placed it in front of the counter, and told the deceased to bring it with him to my house when he came with the keys. This basket could have been seen in the place where I left it when the door was opened. The deceased was a cripple and a very small man. He ought to have been at my house by about 20 minutes to 10, but he did not

come, and the next morning I heard he was at the hospital. Nothing was stolen from the shop but the fish and the basket.

George Lerigo.—I live at Chapel Street, Oxford Street, and am a milliner's porter. I was passing Mr. Berry's shop from Westminster Bridge on the night of the 20th of October, about half-past 9 o'clock. My attention was attracted by hearing a groan from the inside of the shop. It was like that of some one who was suffering. I saw three men standing close to the door of the shop, and apparently looking in. The right-hand side of the door was open about an inch, and quite sufficiently to enable any one to see the counter of the shop. I asked the men what was the matter, and they said it was a man and his wife quarrelling, and I walked on, leaving them behind. When I had got about six yards on, and not quite so far as the mews at the back of Richmond Terrace, I returned, not feeling satisfied with the answer the men had given me, and went again to the door of the shop. All three men were still there. I opened the door. There was a gaslight in the shop. I saw the prisoner standing on the left-hand side and leaning over the counter with a life-preserver in his hand, with which he was striking the deceased, who was crouched down beside the counter. He struck him on his bare head, on the left side, and I saw him strike three or four blows. I then appealed to the passers-by for assistance, and at this time the three men I had first seen had gone away. The persons I applied to stopped and looked in, and the prisoner turned round from the man he was striking, picked up a

parcel from the floor and a piece of lighted cigar from the counter, and went out of the shop with the life-preserver still in his possession. I did not notice what sort of parcel it was that the prisoner picked up. I paid more attention to the man's face. When he came out of the shop he turned to the left towards Westminster Bridge, and I followed him. I said to the people about, "There he goes, won't you secure him?" But they did not interfere, and I pursued the prisoner alone. He went on to Derby Street, and turned down there into Cannon Row, and when he saw I was following him he began to run, and I called out "Stop him, stop him!" When the prisoner got to the end of Cannon Row he crossed Bridge Street and ran down the court opposite towards Palace Yard, and he was stopped in that passage by a waterman named Allen. He was not out of my sight until he got to the passage leading to Palace Yard. I did not see the parcel in the prisoner's hand when he began to run, but he had it up to that time. After the prisoner was secured I went back to the shop and saw the deceased, and he was taken to the hospital. There was no one in the shop but the prisoner and the deceased. There certainly was no woman in the shop. As we were taking the prisoner back to the shop we passed the deceased, who was being carried to the hospital. I am quite sure the prisoner was the man I saw striking the deceased.

Mr. James Gipling said—I am a grocer living at Liverpool Street, King's Cross. I was passing along Parliament Street on the night of the 20th of October, about 25 minutes past 9 o'clock, and I saw several persons standing outside Mr

Berry's shop. The door of the shop was partially open. I saw a man inside the shop in the act of striking at something behind the counter. I then saw the man take up a parcel from the floor, and put a cigar in his mouth and come out. I could not recognise the man who came out. He walked away towards the bridge, and, as the door was opened, I saw a man lying on the floor and bleeding from the head, and I followed the man who had come out of the shop. He turned down Derby Street, and at that time I was about 20 yards behind him; and I observed that he had a parcel in his hand. He turned to the right, and when he found he was pursued he started off, running towards Palace Yard, and I went after him until he was stopped, and only lost sight of him as he turned into Palace Yard.

Henry Croft gave evidence of the same circumstances.

Allen, attendant at the hackney-carriage stand in Palace Yard, deposed to hearing the cry of "Stop him!" and saw the prisoner running. He stopped him. He then had a lighted cigar in one hand, but nothing in the other. It is a most singular coincidence, that this witness, whose capture of the prisoner was the essential point of the case, was the brother-in-law of the murdered man.

Mrs. Mary Walsh said—On the night of the 20th of October I was in Palace Yard, near Canning's statue, when I picked up a life-preserver. It was lying on the foot pavement next to the statue. I afterwards gave the life-preserver to the police inspector.

Mr. H. Burnaby, the chief clerk at Bow Street, deposed that he went with Mr. Jardine, the magistrate, to the Westminster Hos-

pital on the 28th October, and an examination of the wounded man was taken in the prisoner's presence. He took down the statement in writing, and read it over to the prisoner, who had an opportunity of hearing all that took place. Witness asked him if he wished to put any questions to the wounded man, and he said nothing, but shook his head.

The statement was put in and read. It was as follows:—"I know that man. He is the man who struck me. I don't know how many blows he struck me, but he struck me with a life-preserver."

The medical officers described the wounds of the deceased; they were such as would be inflicted by a life-preserver—there was a compound fracture of the skull. The poor man lingered till the 9th of November. The surgeon described the appearance presented by the skull upon the *post-mortem* examination, and stated that the immediate cause of death was the deposition of matter upon the lungs, but he said he had no doubt that the state of the lungs was occasioned by the injury to the head.

Several medical witnesses of repute were called by the Crown to prove that it was a very common result of violent injuries to the head that such a state of the lungs as appeared in this case should be presented. The exact *modus operandi*, one of them said, was a question in dispute among the medical profession, but he believed that they were all agreed upon the fact.

It was, in fact, the case of the prisoner that the poor man had died from disease of the lungs, and not from the injuries he had received.

The jury, however, were quite

satisfied by the evidence of the medical men, and after short deliberation found the prisoner "Guilty." The prisoner, who was a very practised criminal, having been already transported and released on ticket of leave, received his sentence with firmness, and thenceforward to the day of his execution maintained a composed demeanour. He had probably contemplated nothing more than to stun the poor shop-man as a preparation for plundering the shop; but he seems to have been perfectly aware that he had no chance of escaping his doom, and died firmly and with some degree of penitence. It is, however, remarkable that he asserted to the last that he had no accomplices—but that he had accomplices is beyond reasonable doubt. The fish-basket was never produced, nor the black parcel which he held in his hand in his flight—they had probably been passed away to confederates.

It will scarcely be believed that the employer of the boy, Lerigo, discharged him from his service, because his attendance at the police courts interrupted his business. Baron Alderson, however, ordered him to be paid a reward of 20*l.*, and 10*l.* to Allen.

THE TURNER COLLECTION.—After five years of delay and litigation, the admirable collection of pictures bequeathed by the late Joseph William Turner to the public, has at length come into the hands of the Trustees for the nation. This munificent bequest embraced 100 paintings in oil, besides a large quantity of water colour and sepia drawings, the latter forming not the least valuable part of the donation. Of the paintings, 20 were selected by those who had the charge of

them, and were in November added to the collection of English masters at Marlborough House. In accordance, however, with the condition affixed to the bequest by the donor himself, they were placed in a separate apartment. In the choice thus made great judgment was displayed by those upon whom the responsibility of selection was cast, for they placed before the public specimens of every style in which the painter had exercised his versatile pencil. The bizarre character and peculiar mannerisms of Turner's later productions, by which alone he was known to the younger generation of his contemporaries, had somewhat marred his reputation among the general public. The exhibition of his earlier paintings, however, notwithstanding the cramped space available at Marlborough House, and the bad light in which they were hung, removed these prejudices, and the lustre of his former fame was at once restored. Several additions have from time to time been made to the number of his paintings and drawings thus exhibited, and with every successive augmentation of the gallery a corresponding increase took place in the general admiration of the artist's vigour and play of fancy and facility and luminousness of expression, until he stands confessed the first master of the British School, in nearly every style which his great abilities led him to attempt.

DECEMBER.

4. MURDER AND PIRACY.—*Winchester Assizes*.—Giuseppe Legava, Giovanna Barbalano, and Matteo Pettrich, three Italians, were ar-

raigned for the wilful murder, on the high seas, on the 5th of July last, of Joseph Pattinson.

The jury was composed of five foreign gentlemen resident in Winchester, and seven Englishmen taken from the petty jury panel. Mr. Coleridge opened the case, and called the following witnesses :—

George Nelegan.—On the 4th of July last I was a boy on board the *Globe* merchant ship. The three prisoners, with two other foreigners, who went by the names of Angelo and Big Jack, were also on board as seamen. There were also the master and mate, Evan Evans, J. Pattinson, Daniel Cullen, and David Thomas, making in all seven Englishmen and five foreigners. We sailed from the Bosphorus for Balaklava on the 4th of July. My watch was from 8 to 12 that night. I turned into my bunk in the forecastle at half-past 12. J. Pattinson and David Thomas slept about three feet from me; they were on the port side, and I was on the starboard. There was a dim light. After some time I saw two men come into the forecastle. Pattinson and Thomas were then in their bunks. One of the men who came down had a piece of lighted candle in his hand. They went to Pattinson's bunk. The candle was then blown out. After that I heard some heavy substance fall out of Pattinson's berth, and a noise and a groan. The two men then came and sat down talking on the chest opposite my bunk. They then went on deck, and I followed them. Barbalano saw me, and came and stamped down the hatch. He had a sheath knife in his hand, upon seeing which I let go and fell into a hammock below, and then saw David Thomas coming down with

VOL. XCVIII.

his hand to his neck and blood streaming from it. I remained where I was for an hour or two. At last, all being quiet, I went up into the forecastle, and there saw Pattinson lying with his throat cut. He was dead. When Pettrich and Barbalano came down, Pettrich had a pistol in his hand, and Barbalano had a long knife. I asked them not to hurt me. Pettrich caught hold of me, kissed my cheek, and said in English, "Me no touch you." Barbalano and Pettrich ransacked all the men's chests, and took some clothes. Angelo and Lazaro afterwards came down. They also had knives in their hands. Some time afterwards, hearing the mate call out something, I went upon deck, and saw five men pulling away in a boat. No foreigners were then on board.

David Thomas.—I was a seaman on board the *Globe*. On the morning of the 5th of July I was awoken by awful screams. I looked out, and saw Big Jack and another man with him. They had a lighted candle. Big Jack came towards me, and stabbed me on the neck and breast. Pattinson was then asleep in his bunk. I then saw Pattinson fall out of his bunk on to the chest. I was wounded immediately after I heard the screams. I felt blood falling all over me from the bunk above me before Pattinson fell out of his bunk. My bunk was under his. I called out for help, when Evans came about half way down the ladder, and went up again, as I told him to mind himself. I afterwards hid myself, and remained hid for three hours.

John Cullen, another of the seamen, said : While I was at the wheel, Evans gave me some information of what was going on

in the fore-castle. I begged him to go down into the fore-castle, and I saw him going. Legava then came round me at the wheel, and I was shot under the left ear; it was done by a person a little behind me. I fell down on my hands. No other person was near me. Legava then ran past me and cried, "A man-of-war!" A piece of lead was afterwards taken out of my neck in the hospital at Therapia. While I was leaning down the scuttle from loss of blood, I saw the five foreigners together, and shortly afterwards I was stabbed in the back; it bled very much. I put my finger into the wound in my back to stop the bleeding. I then received another wound on the right side of my neck. I was too bad to see the foreigners leave the ship. I was taken to the hospital at Constantinople.

John Scotland.—I was master of the ship *Globe*. I turned into my berth about 12 P.M. on the 4th of July, but did not go to sleep. The mate came to me at half-past 3 to know the time. Immediately upon his coming down I heard two reports of pistols. I and the mate then went on the poop-deck, where we heard Evans and Cullen calling out that they were shot. I saw Legava and Angelo at that moment with pistols in their hands, which they presented at us. They flashed, but did not go off. Legava pointed his pistol at me. We were both unarmed, and carried the wounded men into my cabin. I then missed a musket I had in my cabin. I found an old musket barrel, which I cleaned, fastened to a walking-stick, and loaded it, and with this we kept watch. We remained below from half-past 3 till 10 o'clock. When I was below I saw

Legava at the wheel. I several times asked the foreigners what they wanted, but they said nothing till about 9 o'clock, when Angelo said all they wanted was money. Upon this I gave five sovereigns to the mate, who put it in a bit of paper and lashed it to the end of a ramrod, and handed it up to them at the companion door. Angelo said they wanted more, I said I had given them all I had, and would allow them to come down to search the cabin. The mate and I went into another cabin, and the prisoners came down into the state room. Angelo came first, the others following. Legava had a pistol in his hand, on cock and loaded to the muzzle. We had no pistols on board the ship. Angelo brought my chest out, and I saw him take out my purse. Legava looked into the berth where the two wounded men were lying. I afterwards missed my silver watch. The prisoners then went on deck and I heard a noise, and upon looking out of the window I saw the prisoners and the other two foreigners rowing away in a boat. I then went on deck, and found Pattinson with his head nearly cut off. He seemed to have had two cuts. Thomas had his throat cut in two places.

William Scotland.—I was the mate, and I am brother to the captain. I was on deck from 12 till half-past 3. Two of the prisoners were in my watch. I went below, and then I heard the report of three pistols; and then I ran up on the deck, and cried out to the master, who turned out. I got on deck first, and found Evan Evans and Cullen on the starboard quarter-deck, crying "They were shot; they were shot." I ran forward, and saw Legava running

away with a pistol in his hand. Legava and the cook came to the front with pistols presented at us. I was nearest to them. The pistols were snapped, but did not explode. I then helped the wounded men down below in the cabin. I got out the medicine chest, and dressed their wounds, as well as I could. I attempted to get some water from the steward's pantry. As I was going out Pettrich again presented a pistol at me. The master proposed that we should hang out the ensign as a signal of distress. I did so, but the ensign was found afterwards torn in the longboat. I offered them money, but they would not take it, and then we gave them liberty to come into the cabin. Angelo afterwards asked me for more money, and said if we did not give it him they would come down, break into the cabin, and murder us, and run the ship ashore. When they came into the cabin we moved into the other cabin. They then went away, and I saw Pattinson lying on his back on the deck quite dead.

John Burridge.—I am a gunner in the Marine Artillery. In July I was one of the crew of the gunboat *Recruit*, which was sent into the Black Sea to look after these men. We landed 30 or 40 miles from the Bosphorus, and we went to New Town. We there found the prisoners. They were searched by the Turks. A pistol and some money were found on them. Another man escaped into the woods. With the three prisoners on board we went back to Constantinople.

Mr. Yonge addressed the jury for the prisoners, urging the probability that the two missing men had committed the murder, as there was no evidence to show by

whose hand Pattinson's life had been taken.

The learned Judge then most carefully summed up the case, explaining to the jury the law as regarded persons acting with a common design.

The jury retired for about two hours, and then returned a verdict of "Guilty" against all the prisoners.

Mr. Justice Coleridge then pronounced upon them the sentence of death.

The prisoners were then removed, protesting their innocence, and saying that, as the witnesses had been heard against them, they ought to be allowed to make their statement.

The prisoners afterwards confessed their guilt to their spiritual advisers, and, from the disclosures then made, it appeared that their past lives had been of the most fearful character. Legava, in particular, acknowledged himself to have been concerned in several murders in different countries, and to have been the instigator and contriver of the plot on board the *Globe*. They were all executed in front of Winchester Gaol. When the prisoners were led on to the scaffold, they began with loud vociferations to express their penitence in the Italian language. These exclamations being mistaken by the mob, which had assembled to witness the execution, for protestations of innocence, gave rise to much commiseration, and created a scene of the most painful excitement.

4. DOUBLE MURDER IN YORKSHIRE.—Another of those terrible crimes which, unhappily, have of late been so frequently recorded, has been committed at the village of Bolton-upon-Dearne, about eight miles north of Rotherham. The

victims were Luke White, aged 61, and Elizabeth, his wife, aged 60. The aged couple resided alone, White acting as postmaster of the place, and carrying on the business of a druggist and grocer. The house is in the village street, and consists of a shop with a parlour behind, and also a kitchen on the ground-floor. The connection between the shop and the house is by an inner door in the right-hand corner of the shop into a passage; that passage runs along the back of the shop, and then along the side of the parlour to the kitchen. Along one side at the end of the shop is the counter, with an opening in it at the angle opposite the door into the passage; the kitchen is the room in which White and his wife ordinarily lived. White has for some years been a local preacher among the Calvinists, and was in the habit of sitting up reading till 11 or 12 o'clock at night. He usually closed the shutters of his shop at dusk, leaving the door unfastened till about 10. During the evening a lamp burnt upon the counter, but when any customer came in he would usually go from the kitchen into the shop carrying a candle. He was last seen alive a little before 10 o'clock on Thursday night by a girl, who called to purchase some candles. On Friday morning the shop was not opened as usual, and a woman who wanted to purchase some articles, tried the door and found it unfastened. She entered the shop, and was horrified to see White lying dead in a pool of blood at the opening of the counter which communicates with the inner door. A candlestick stood upon the counter, with the candle burnt down to the socket. The old man's spectacles lay among the blood on

the floor; the oil-lamp on the counter had burnt out. The alarm being given, the neighbours came, when still further horrors were discovered. White had been struck about the head and face by some heavy instrument, which had inflicted severe cuts, and he appeared to have been struck down just as he reached the counter and had set down the candle. On the assistants passing into the house, the body of Mrs. White was found in the passage outside the kitchen-door. She lay with her head towards the shop, and a candle and candlestick lay separated, as if they had fallen from her hands. Her death had also been caused by frightful blows on the head and face.

On examining the shop a cupboard was found to have been broken open. White was in the habit of keeping his money in a canvas bag in his shop-desk, which was found unlocked and the bag empty. The body of the old man did not appear to have been robbed. There were no appearances in the upper rooms of the house, of the drawers, &c., having been ransacked, but all were found unlocked. On the table in the sitting-room, the Bible was found open, and a rug was on the sofa, lying as though it had been dropped from a person's shoulders; and it seems clear that the old man had been engaged in reading the Scriptures when the sound of a person entering the shop had roused him to attend to his supposed customer, and that on entering the shop he was instantly struck down, and killed by repeated blows. It is also clear that his wife, hearing the noise, was about to pass into the shop, when she was felled and dispatched. No noise is said to have been heard in

the neighbouring houses. The perpetrators of this inhuman deed have eluded discovery.

5. MURDER OF TWO CHILDREN BY THEIR FATHER.—*Chester Assizes.*—William Jackson, aged 35, was indicted for the murder of his son. The prisoner was described as an upholsterer, and well educated.

From the evidence produced at the trial it appeared that the prisoner had been for some time separated from his wife, and was at the time of the murder living with his sister at Chester. There had been four children of the marriage, two of whom were left under the care of their mother, while the others, John Edward Jackson, and Mary Anne Jackson, of the respective ages of five and six years, were resident with the prisoner. Early on the morning of the 27th of September he left his sister's house, and called at the Coach and Horses Inn at Handbridge, near Chester, which was kept by a Mr. Rogers, who had married a distant connection. While the prisoner remained there, about half-past 10 in the morning, the two children were brought in by a girl, who said she had orders from their aunt, her mistress, to leave them there. Mrs. Rogers remonstrated with the prisoner about this proceeding, telling him that she could not keep them. The prisoner, saying that he did not want her to keep them, went to the door, and called out to the servant-girl, who had by that time started on her way home, to come back and take the children to their aunt's again. The girl, however, in obedience to her mistress's orders, would not return, and thereupon the prisoner himself left the Coach and Horses. He came back again in the course of half-an-hour, and then, apparently

without having said anything in the interval, he again left the house, taking with him the little girl. He carried her on his left arm, and, as the poor child's feet were bare, he was noticed to be very particular in covering them with the flap of his coat. Mrs. Rogers did not remark the direction he took, but by a neighbour he was observed to go into an enclosure called Rogers' Gardens. In that place the father cut his daughter's throat, though, as the evidence showed, there must have been some slight struggle, in the course of which the unfortunate child's right thumb was completely severed from her hand, probably in an instinctive but ineffectual endeavour to arrest the fatal instrument. After an absence of 30 minutes in all, he again went back to the Coach and Horses, and saying to the little boy, "Come, Jack, now," he took him up in his arms and left the house, having first taken the same precautions to cover the feet of his son as he had done those of his daughter. He was again seen to enter the enclosure, and there could be no doubt but that he murdered his son in the same manner as he had killed his other child. From the appearance presented by the body of the former he was conjectured to have died without a struggle. Nothing more was seen of the prisoner until about half-past 4 o'clock, when he entered the house of an acquaintance, who lived within a short distance of Rogers' Gardens. His right arm was observed to be "slushed" from the elbow downwards with mud, and his boots very dirty. He washed his hands and then left the premises. Mrs. Rogers saw him before dark on the same day, and naturally asked

him where he had taken his children. He replied that he had left them at a friend's house, and thus matters went on for some days. The prolonged absence of the children, however, began at last to give rise to suspicion, rumours of foul play grew rife, and were not diminished by the evasive answers he gave to the neighbours' inquiries. These rumours at last reached the ears of his wife, who immediately came to Chester, and caused a search to be instituted. The clue was obtained by some means, and the bodies of the unfortunate children were found buried in one grave in the enclosure alluded to. Of course, under such circumstances as these, a conviction was not to be avoided; the prisoner's counsel, however, urged, from the improbability of a father's murdering his children, without a more definite reason than was assigned, that the act could only have resulted from some sudden paroxysm of passion, and that thus the crime would be reduced from murder to manslaughter. With regard to this line of defence, the learned Judge, in his summing up, observed, that, as the children were of too tender years to be capable of giving a sufficient provocation, the question lay between a verdict of guilty, on the charge of murder, or a complete acquittal. The jury found the prisoner guilty of murder, and he heard the sentence of death delivered with the same show of indifference which he had exhibited throughout the whole trial. He was executed at Chester on the 20th of December, having previously made a full confession of his guilt.

13. THE ARMLEY MURDER.—*York Assizes*.—John Hannah was charged with the wilful murder of Jane Banham, at Armley, near

Leeds, on the 11th of September last.

The prisoner, a tall, fair-haired young man, neatly dressed, and by no means ill-looking, was placed at the bar, and called on to plead. After a paroxysm of grief, he flung his hands wildly above his head, and cried, "Oh, God!—not guilty;" and throughout the trial he continued sobbing and beating his forehead with his hands.

It appeared from the evidence that the prisoner was a tailor, living in Manchester, and that the deceased, Jane Banham, was the principal dancer in a travelling corps of performers, which attended the principal towns of the West Riding. The deceased had been married to one William Banham, who afterwards left her, and proceeded to America. She then formed a connection with the prisoner. They lived together as man and wife, and had two children. About a fortnight before Christmas last the prisoner and deceased separated, when the latter and the two children went to live with her father, Mr. John Hope, also a member of the same corps. In June the company were performing at Halifax, to which place the prisoner had walked over from Manchester, and after a night exhibition followed the deceased and her father home, expressing a desire to speak with the former. Her father at first refused; but the prisoner persisting he was allowed an interview the next morning, at which he was heard to say that if she did not mind, and would not do what he wanted, he would be hung for her yet. In September the company was at Armley, near Leeds, where the prisoner appeared on the 11th of September, and as Mrs. Banham was at a rehearsal

at the time, he sent one of the *troupe* to request an interview with her, and waited her arrival at the Malt Mill Inn in that place. Whilst there one of his children ran by, upon which the prisoner came out, caught it in his arms and brought it into the parlour of the Inn, fondling it with every mark of affection. Shortly afterwards the deceased and her father joined him. The prisoner then renewed his solicitations, urging the deceased to return to his house, and on her refusal appealed to her father to speak in his behalf. The latter declined, saying, "That he would have nothing to do with the matter," and left the room. After a short time the deceased also came out, and was heard to say in a sharp tone as she did so, "I want nothing more to do with you." The prisoner, speaking in a kind manner, rejoined, "Come in again a minute," pulled her back into the room, and closed the door. A few minutes afterwards a rattling of chairs was heard in the room, when the landlady of the Inn being alarmed went into the room, followed by other persons. They found the deceased lying on the ground, with the prisoner kneeling upon her, grasping her throat tightly with one of his hands. One of the incomers exclaimed, "What do you mean you rascal!" whereupon the prisoner turned round and said, "I mean murder," and before aid could be given to the unfortunate woman he inflicted two severe gashes on her throat with a razor. He then rose, saying, "I have done what I intended," and left the room before the bystanders could recover from their stupefaction. The deceased also rose and staggered into the street, streaming with blood. She

was immediately removed to her lodgings and medical assistance procured, but in about two hours afterwards she died, and the medical man expressed his surprise that she lived so long. Pursuit was also made after the prisoner, and he was apprehended before he had run far.

The prisoner's counsel contended that there was no evidence of malice prepense, but that the case was one of aggravated manslaughter rather than murder. The jury, however, found a verdict of "Guilty," and he was sentenced to be hanged. This was carried into execution at York.

18. FEARFUL ACCIDENT IN A ROLLING-MILL.—An inquest was held on the body of William Webster, a man 26 years of age, who met with a most fearful death at the extensive ironworks of the Bowling Iron Company, Bradford. Webster was employed in a rolling-mill, the floor of which is constructed of iron plates, with apertures or "manholes," through which, as all the shafting is beneath the floor, the workmen are enabled to descend to oil the shafts or repair the adjacent machinery. On the morning of the 17th the unfortunate man went down one of the manholes, with a light in his hand, in order to lubricate some cog-wheels. Robert Binns, a fellow-workman, followed him part of the way, as he desired to borrow Webster's lamp; but on receiving a refusal, he returned, and had scarcely reached the flooring above when he heard a dreadful shriek and "Oh, dear me," from Webster, and on listening at the aperture he discerned a noise in the distance resembling the crunching of bones. An alarm was given throughout the works, the engines

were immediately stopped, portions of the massive iron flooring were removed, and the workmen descended to search for their unfortunate companion. He was discovered partially wrapt round a shaft, dreadfully mutilated, and wedged in between the shaft and the groove in which it revolved. The shaft had to be raised by means of heavy blocks before the poor fellow's remains could be extricated. The head was severed from the body, and reduced almost to a state of pulp, a leg and an arm were torn away, the bowels protruded, and the other parts of the body were so crushed and mangled that, had they not been partially held together by the clothing, it would have been impossible to recognize them as belonging to a human being.

19. MURDER AT DOVER.—Thomas Mansell, aged 28, soldier, was indicted at the Maidstone Winter Assizes for the wilful murder of Alexander M'Burnie.

The details of this crime do not present any remarkable distinction from other regimental murders that have been frequently chronicled. But the trial and final execution of the prisoner were attended by circumstances which attracted public attention.

The evidence will sufficiently narrate the committal of the murder and the supposed motive.

It was intimated that one of the jury entertained a conscientious objection to the punishment of death, and desired to be excused from serving.

He was accordingly allowed to leave the box, and another juror was sworn in his place.

Edward Brophy.—I am a private in the 49th Regiment. The prisoner was also a private in the

same regiment. The deceased was lance-corporal. I remember the morning of the 27th of August last. The regiment was at that time at Dover, under canvas in the hospital field. I went out of my tent about half-past 8 o'clock in the morning, and I saw the deceased come out of his tent, and he knelt down and was in the act of cleaning his ramrod. The prisoner had his firelock in his hand, and he walked a few paces and then stooped and put a cap on the nipple, and he then presented the piece at the deceased and fired. He held the stock of the gun to his hip when he discharged the piece. The deceased immediately got up, put his hand to his side and said, "I am shot, I am shot! Oh, Lord! Mansell has shot me." The prisoner then threw his firelock down and exclaimed, "Now, then!" or "There, now!" A doctor was immediately sent for, and the deceased was taken to the hospital. The prisoner walked away nearly to his own tent, and then he was seized and taken to the guard-room.

This evidence was repeated by another private of the regiment.

John Perry gave similar evidence.

Peter Moran, another private, said:—He also distinctly saw the prisoner deliberately shoot the deceased, and after the transaction he dug a rifle bullet out of the ground on the other side of the spot where the deceased was standing at the time he was shot. The bullet was produced by an officer of police, and the witness identified it, and said it was of the same description as those furnished to the regiment in the Crimea (where the prisoner and his victim both had served).

Re-examined. — The prisoner

was so close to M'Burnie when he fired that the powder burnt his shirt.

Benjamin Taylor, another private, said that the prisoner lodged in the same tent with him. About a week before the occurrence he had some conversation with him about some boots he had bought, and he said that "M'Burnie knew something about them, and he would have it in for him if he lived for a thousand years." He said he did not know exactly what the prisoner meant, but he understood that it was intended as a threat against the deceased.

He had heard it rumoured in the regiment that the prisoner had lost a pair of boots while he was in the Crimea.

Richard Holden, sergeant-major of the regiment, proved that in July last they were stationed at Aldershott, and the prisoner made a complaint to the commanding-officer relating to a pair of boots which he said he had lost in the Crimea. He said he had packed them up in a squad bag, and when it was opened at Aldershott they were not forthcoming, and he said he was confident that M'Burnie knew something about them. The commanding officer made inquiries, and decided that the deceased knew nothing about the prisoner's boots, and he told the prisoner so, and said he must put up with the loss. He appeared discontented with the decision, but did not make any remark. The prisoner served with the regiment through all the Crimean campaign, and bore a good conduct stripe. He believed that the prisoner's suspicion against the deceased in relation to the boots was entirely imaginary. The deceased was a remarkably quiet, inoffensive man, and he never appeared to bear any ill-will to the prisoner.

The prisoner, it appeared, did not at any time deny that he had shot his officer, but rather seemed to think he had ample justification; and in a letter which he wrote from Maidstone Gaol to a comrade, his chief anxiety appeared to be to know whether his boots had been found in his victim's baggage.

Mr. Russell made a powerful address to the jury, basing his defence on the ground of insanity.

The jury, however, found the prisoner "Guilty," and he was sentenced to be hanged.

The circumstance before alluded to, as having made the trial remarkable, was an ingenious point taken by Mr. Russell as to the constitution of the jury. It is well known that in certain towns of Kent a kind of association has been formed by persons who object to the infliction of death as a punishment for crime; and that one means they have adopted for enforcing their dogma is, that when any one of the association serves on a jury trying a capital case, he does not find the prisoner guilty. The people of Maidstone were reported to be strongly possessed of this unjustifiable determination. The prisoner's counsel was therefore resolved to have at least one Maidstone man on the jury; the counsel for the Crown were equally resolved not to have any one from that locality. The jury-list consisted of 59 jurymen, of whom 12 were engaged on another trial; the prisoner's counsel challenged 20, the Crown challenged others, and none remained but Maidstone men. All these were ordered to stand by on the objection of the Crown. The consequence was, that when the list was gone through only nine of the persons summoned remained unobjected to, and the counsel for the Crown proposed to take the other

three from the other jury, which had now come into court and delivered its verdict. The prisoner's counsel, of course, objected to anything that did not suit his client, and proposed to go through the list again, insisting that now the Crown should challenge no one "without cause." A very learned squabble ensued, which gave occasion to the judge (Baron Bramwell) to read a severe lecture to all whom it might concern, on the wickedness of a man getting into the jury-box and doing otherwise than he is sworn to do. This, of course, gave the prisoner's counsel the opportunity of saying that his client's case was prejudiced by the interference of the judge. Three jurymen were taken, as proposed, from the other jury; but before they were sworn one of them declared himself to have a conscientious objection to the punishment of death, and desired to be excused from serving. He was ordered to stand by, and another from the other jury was sworn in his place.

Upon this state of things, Mr. Russell raised a variety of technical objections, and a writ of error was sued out in order to submit the case to the consideration of the Judges. The matter was argued before those learned persons with great skill and ingenuity; but their opinions were unanimous that the objections were technical merely, and did not affect the merits of the case—that the prisoner had had a fair trial.

It was thought that the length of time during which the prisoner's life had been in suspense would have induced the Home Secretary to recommend a commutation of sentence; and the circumstances of his crime which pointed to a morbid, if not to decidedly dis-

eased, state of mind, and the observations of the Judge at his trial, were urged in his favour. The authorities, however, were firm, and the prisoner was executed at Maidstone seven months after his conviction.

THE WEATHER.—The weather during this quarter presented a few remarkable features. The month of October was much warmer than usual—from 3° to $4\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ in excess—very wet and foggy. On the other hand, in November there was a considerable period of hard frost, with the thermometer 9° below the average, and little rain. The earlier days of December were very cold, it was an average cold month, with some bitter days. The barometer ranged remarkably high in October and November. The greatest amount of cold was registered at Lampeter, $2^{\circ}.8$; Wakefield, $3^{\circ}.0$; York, $5^{\circ}.0$; and Belvoir, $6^{\circ}.3$.

On the 4th of December the waters about the metropolis were hard frozen, and the skaters and sliders enjoyed themselves on the Serpentine and in the Regent's Park. The streets were very slippery, and an unusual number of accidents occurred. The footing was so insecure that the horses could scarcely draw the public vehicles. Few private carriages ventured out. This severe weather broke up suddenly, and was succeeded by unusual warmth and gales from the S.S.W.

SANITARY CONDITION OF ENGLAND.—The thirty-second quarterly return of the Registrar General makes a very gratifying announcement. It states that the returns of the births and deaths for last year (1855) imply that in the country, as well as in the metropolis, the health of the population of England and Wales is better

than it was in any of the previous ten years; and that the effect of sanitary measures, although ineffectively carried out, and confined to limited districts, is apparent. In the ten years from 1846 to 1855 the average of deaths was 23 to every 1000 persons annually; while in 1856 that proportion had dropped to less than 21 in every 1000. While the existing population is thus departing with diminished celerity, our numbers are increased by births in unusual proportion. The children born in the year 1856 amount to 657,704, the largest number that has ever been registered in any year; exceeding those of the previous year by 22,581; and bearing the proportion of 3.454 to 1000, the average of ten preceding years being 3.339 to 1000. Nor, to judge by the preparations made for further adding to the subjects of Her Majesty, would it appear that this increase of mouths at all press upon the means of subsistence; for the marriages in 1856 were 159,183 against 152,113 in 1855; or the rate of marriage was 814 to 100,000 persons, against an average rate, 805 to 100,000. The natural increase of the population in 1856—that is, the balance after deducting the deaths from the births—was 266,335. The number of emigrants of English origin was 70,285. These figures apply only to England and Wales. Taking the United Kingdom, the probable natural increase of the population is 1000 a day.

WRECKS IN 1856.—The Merchant Shipping Act of 1854 having now come into full operation, the Board of Trade have been enabled to make a return of the wrecks and casualties on the coast of the United Kingdom, more complete and more

elaborate than they have hitherto presented.

It appears that the total number of wrecks and casualties in 1856 was 1115, burthen 229,936 tons, crews 10,014. Of these ships, 834 were British, 32 Colonial, 237 Foreign; 34 were from 600 to 900 tons burthen; 15 from 900 to 1200 tons; 12 from 1200 tons upwards. Of these wrecks and casualties, 419 involved total loss; 734 damages only; 51 total wrecks; and 265 damages were caused by collision—a great excess over previous years, due to the greater completion of the arrangements for reporting.

Of the total wrecks and casualties, there occurred in January, 149; February, 154; March, 96; April, 74; May, 57; June, 32; July, 48; August, 51; September, 98; October, 99; November, 129; December, 166. Upon the whole, excepting collisions, the number of disasters at sea, in 1856, were slightly fewer than in 1855.

The total number of lives lost in 1856 (as far as can be ascertained) was 521; in 1852, 920; 1853, 689; 1854, 1549; 1855, 469. In 1856, 2243 persons were saved from drowning by wrecks, by meritorious exertions of life boats, ships and luggers, persons on shore, &c., and 28 by the exertions of individuals.

The disasters by which the greatest loss of life was incurred were—the *Ocean Home*, sunk off the Lizard, 75 lives lost; by collision of the *Helen Heilgers* and the *Yeoman*, off the coast of Ireland, 19 persons drowned; the *Josephine Willis*, collision, 69 lives lost; *Cashmere*, abandoned at sea, 16 lives lost; the *Great Duke*, wrecked in Ballyslughter Bay, 29 lives lost; the *Lion*, wrecked on Sunk Sand, 12 lives lost.

Return of the number and nature of the accidents and the injuries to life and limb which have occurred on all the Railways open for Traffic in England and Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, respectively from the 1st of January to the 31st December, 1856.

	Killed.	Injured.
Passengers killed or injured from causes beyond their own control	8	282
Passengers killed or injured from their own misconduct or want of caution	19	16
Servants of companies or of contractors killed or injured from causes beyond their own control	30	46
Servants of companies or of contractors killed or injured from their own misconduct or want of caution	112	34
Other persons killed or injured in crossing at level crossings	28	2
Trespassers (2 suicides)	71	7
Miscellaneous	13	7
Total from all causes	281	394
England and Wales	232	344
Scotland	30	37
Ireland	19	13

	Miles.
Length of railway open on the 31st December, 1856.	8703
Ditto on the 31st December, 1855	8293

Increase of mileage during the year	410
---	-----

Collisions between passenger trains	3
Collisions between passenger trains and other trains or engines	36
Passenger trains or portions of trains getting off the rails	1
Passenger trains running into sidings or off their proper line, through points being wrong	3
Axles or wheels of machinery of engines attached to passenger trains, breaking or getting out of order	2
Axles or wheels of carriages of passenger trains breaking	2
Couplings breaking	0
Bursting of boilers of engines of passenger trains	1
Trains running into stations at too high a rate of speed	2
Total accidents to passenger trains	37
Total accidents to goods and mineral trains	6
Grand total to all trains	43

APPENDIX TO CHRONICLE.

The MINISTRY, as it stood on the 1st of January, 1856.

IN THE CABINET.

First Lord of the Treasury	Right Hon. Viscount Palmerston.
Lord Chancellor	Right Hon. Lord Cranworth.
President of the Council	Right Hon. Earl Granville.
Lord Privy Seal	Right Hon. Earl of Harrowby.
Home Secretary	Right Hon. Sir George Grey, bt.
Foreign Secretary	Right Hon. Earl of Clarendon.
Colonial Secretary	Right Hon. Henry Labouchere.
War Secretary	Right Hon. Lord Panmure.
Chancellor of the Exchequer	Right Hon. Sir George Cornwall Lewis, bt.
First Lord of the Admiralty	Right Hon. Sir Charles Wood, bt.
President of the Board of Control . .	Right Hon. Robert Vernon Smith.
President of the Board of Trade . .	Right Hon. Lord Stanley of Alderley.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster .	Right Hon. Matthew Talbot Baines.
Postmaster General	His Grace the Duke of Argyll.
	Most Hon. Marquess of Lansdowne.

NOT IN THE CABINET,

Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief .	Right Hon. Viscount Hardinge.
Paymaster of the Forces and Vice-President of the Board of Trade . . . }	Right Hon. Robert Lowe.
First Commissioner of Works and Public Buildings }	Right Hon. Sir Benjamin Hall, bt.
Attorney-General	Sir Alexander James Edmund Cockburn, knt.
Solicitor-General	Sir Richard Bethell, knt.
Judge-Advocate-General	Right Hon. Charles Pelham Villiers.
Chief Commissioner of the Poor Law .	Right Hon. Edward Pleydell Bouverie.

SCOTLAND.

Lord Advocate	Right Hon. James Moncreiff.
Solicitor-General	Edward Francis Maitland, esq.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant	Right Hon. Earl of Carlisle.
Lord Chancellor	Right Hon. Maziere Brady.
Chief Secretary	Right Hon. Edward Horsman.
Attorney-General	Right Hon. William Keogh.
Solicitor-General	John David Fitzgerald, esq.

QUEEN'S HOUSEHOLD.

Lord Steward	Right Hon. Earl Spencer.
Lord Chamberlain	Most Hon. Marquess of Breadalbane.
Master of the Horse	His Grace the Duke of Wellington.
Mistress of the Robes	Duchess of Sutherland.

THE FOLLOWING CHANGES TOOK PLACE DURING THE YEAR.

H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, General Commanding-in-Chief, *vice* Viscount Hardinge, deceased.

Sir Richard Bethell, knt., Attorney-General, *vice* Sir A. Cockburn, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas.

The Right Hon. J. A. Stuart Wortley, Solicitor-General, *vice* Sir R. Bethell.

The Right Hon. J. D. Fitzgerald, Attorney-General for Ireland, *vice* Right Hon. W. Keogh, a Justice of the Common Pleas.

Jonathan Christian, esq., Solicitor-General for Ireland, *vice* Keogh.

SHERIFFS FOR THE YEAR 1856.

ENGLAND.

Bedfordshire	Tabot Barnard, of Kempston, esq.
Berks	George Barker, of Stanlake House, esq.
Bucks	Will. Fred. Farrer, of Brayfield House, esq.
Camb. and Hunts	James Gay, of Upwell, esq.
Cheshire	Richard Christopher Naylor, of Hooton Hall, esq.
Cornwall	Sir William Berkeley Call, of Whiteford, bart.
Cumberland	Sir Henry Ralph Vane, of Hatton Hall, bart.
Derbyshire	Alfred Meller Mundy, of Shipley Hall, esq.
Devonshire	James Samuel Pitman, of Dunchidrock, esq.
Dorsetshire	Charles James Radclyffe, of Hyde, Bere Regis, esq.
Durham	Robert Smith Surtees, of Hamsterley Hall, esq.
Essex	Robert Hills, of Colne Engaine, esq.
Gloucestershire	Sir Charles Rushout Rushout, of Seizincote House, bart.
Herefordshire	Charles William Allen, of the Moor, esq.
Herts	William Joseph Meyers, of Porters Shenley, esq.
Kent	Richard Paterson, of Leeson, Chislehurst, esq.
Lancashire	Robert Needham Philips, of the Park, Manchester, esq.
Leicestershire	Thomas Cope, of Osbaston, esq.
Lincolnshire	Charles Thomas John Moore, of Frampton Hall, esq.
Monmouthshire	Edward Bagnall Dimmack, of Pontypool, esq.
Norfolk	Robert Kellett Long, of Dunston, esq.
Northamptonshire	Oscar William Hambrough, of Pipewell Hall, esq.
Northumberland	Bryan Burrell, of Broome Park, esq.
Nottinghamshire	Samuel William Welfitt, of Langwith Lodge.
Oxfordshire	William Evetts, of Tackley Park, esq.
Rutlandshire	Clarke Morris, of Oakham, esq.
Shropshire	Edward Lloyd Gatacre, of Gatacre, esq.
Somersetshire	John Hippisley, of Ston Easton, esq.
Staffordshire	Richard Dyott, of Freeford, esq.
Southampton, Co. of	James Edward Bradshaw, of Fair Oak Park, esq.
Suffolk	Andrew Arcedeckne, of Glevering Hall, esq.
Surrey	Edward Richard Northey, of Woodcote House, esq.
Sussex	William Drew Lucas Shadwell, of Fair Light Hall, esq.
Warwickshire	Sir Peter Van Notten Pole, of Todenham House, bart.
Westmoreland	William Wilkinson, of Warcop, esq.
Wiltshire	Charles William Miles, of Burton Hill House, esq.
Worcestershire	Francis Tongue Rufford, of Prescott House, esq.
Yorkshire	Harry Stephen Thompson, of Kirby Hall, esq.

ELECTED BY THE LIVERY OF LONDON.

London and Middlesex	{ John Joseph Mechi, esq.
	{ Frederick Keats, esq.

WALES.

Anglesey	John Jacob, of Llanfawr, esq.
Breconshire	Thomas Davies, of Llangattock Court, esq.
Carmarthenshire	George Watkin Rice, of Llwynybrain, esq.
Carnarvonshire	Lieut.-Col. John Macdonald, of Plas ucha Dwygyfylchwy.
Cardiganshire	Thomas Henry Winwood, of Tyglyn Aeron, esq.
Denbighshire	John Jesse, of Llanbedr Hall, esq.

Flintshire	Frederick Philips, of Rhual, esq.
Glamorganshire	John Samuel, of Newton House, esq.
Montgomeryshire . . .	Richard Herbert Mytton, of Garth, esq.
Merionethshire	John Priestley, of Hafadygregoge, esq.
Pembrokeshire	Lewis Mathias, of Lamphey Court, esq.
Radnorshire	Robert Baskerville Richard Mynors, of Evancoed, esq.

IRELAND.

Antrim	Ambrose O'Rork, Ahoghill, esq.
Armagh	Henry Alexander, Forkhill House, Forkhill, esq.
Carlow	Peter Fitzgerald, Knight of Kerry, Ballywilliam, Bagnals-town.
Carrickfergus Town . .	Thomas Mercer Bernie, Carrickfergus, esq.
Cavan	Robert John Cuning, Crower, Mount Nugent, esq.
Clare	Francis Gore, Tyredagh Castle, Tulla, esq.
Cork	Alexander M'Carthy, Currymount, Buttevant, esq.
Cork City	Sir William Lyons, Cork.
Donegal	Wm. Henry Marsham Style, Glenmore, Stranorlar, esq.
Down	Francis Charles Leslie, Ballyward, Rathfriland, esq.
Drogheda Town	John M'Cann, Beaumont, Drogheda, esq.
Dublin	Thomas Baker, Courtlough, Balbriggan, esq.
Dublin City	James West, College Green, esq.
Fermanagh	George F. Brook, Ashbrook, Brookboro', esq.
Galway	Stephen Roche, Rye Hill, Monivea, esq.
Galway Town	Ambrose Rush, Taylor Hill, Galway, esq.
Kerry	Richard Chute, Chute Hall, Tralee, esq.
Kildare	Edward M. O'Ferrall, Kildangan, Monasterevan, esq.
Kilkenny	Arthur Kavanagh, Borris House, Borris, esq.
Kilkenny City	Edward Mullhallan, Seville Lodge, Kilkenny, esq.
King's County	William G. D. Nesbitt, Tubberdaly House, Edenderry, esq.
Leitrim	Francis La Touche, Drumkierny, Leitrim, esq.
Limerick	John White, Belmont, Castleconnell, esq.
Limerick City	Helenus White, George's-street, Limerick, esq.
Londonderry	Harvey Nicholson, Roe Park, Newtownlimavady, esq.
Longford	John Bond, Drinnacor, Ballymahon, esq.
Louth	Myles Taaffe, Smarmore, Ardee, esq.
Mayo	George C. O'Donnell, Newport House, Newport, esq.
Meath	Christopher A. Nicholson, Belrath, Kells, esq.
Monaghan	James Henry Boyd, Castleblayney, esq.
Queen's Co.	The Hon. Henry Flower, The Castle, Durrow.
Roscommon	Arthur O'Connor, Elphin House, Elphin, esq.
Sligo	Richard Graves Brinkley, Ardagh, Riverstown, esq.
Tipperary	Edward Bagwell Purefoy, Greenfield, Tipperary, esq.
Tyrone	Francis John Graham, Drumgoon, Maguiresbridge, esq.
Waterford	Sir John Henry Kane, Cappelquin House, Cappelquin, bart.
Waterford City	Joseph D. Lapham, Newtown, Waterford, esq.
Westmeath	Sir Benjamin Chapman, Killua Castle, Athboy, bart.
Wexford	William Bolton, Island, Kilmucridge, esq.
Wicklow	Andrew Byrne, Croneyburne, Rathdrum, esq.

BIRTHS.

BIRTHS.

1856.

JANUARY.

1. At Harewood House, Salop, the lady of Charles Lloyd Jones, esq., a son.
2. At Rankeilour House, Mrs. Maitland Makgill Crichton, of Rankeilour, a son.
— At Paris, the Countess of Warwick, a son.
4. At Woburn, Chertsey, the Hon. Mrs. Locke King, a daughter.
— At the Rectory, West Buckland, the lady of the Rev. J. L. Brereton, a son.
8. At the Vicarage, Canford, Dorset, the Lady Louisa Ponsonby, a son.
10. At Rawmarsh Rectory, Rotherham, Lady Mahon, a son.
11. At Wellington, New Zealand, the lady of Col. McCleverty, Dep. Quart. Gen., a daughter.
— At Rathronan House, county Tipperary, the Hon. Mrs. Gough, a son.
— At Churchill, county Armagh, the lady of William Verner, esq., a son.
13. At Grenden Hall, Warwickshire, the Lady Charlotte Chetwynd, a son.
16. At Trabolgan, the Lady Fermoy, a son.
— In Cavendish-square, the Duchess of Manchester, a daughter.
17. At Eilanach, Inverness, the lady of Maj.-Gen. Patrick Grant, C.B., a son.
18. In Amphill-square, the lady of J. P. Collier, esq., a son.
19. At Hurstbourne Park, Hants, the Countess of Portsmouth, a son and heir.
20. At Florence, the Countess of Airlie, a son and heir.
— In Brook-street, Lady Emily Dunbarvon, a daughter.
21. In Berkeley-square, the Lady Macdonald, a daughter.
23. In Dover-street, Hon. Mrs. Leveson Randolph, a son.
24. At Brussels, the lady of J. T. Houlton, esq., of Farleigh Castle, Somerset, a son.
25. At Edinburgh, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Onslow, a son.
— At Malta, the lady of Comm. Hore, R.N., H.M.S. *Vesuvius*, a son.
26. At the Rectory, Adlestrop, the lady of the Hon. and Rev. H. P. Cholmondeley, a daughter.
27. At Oak Bank, Sevenoaks, the lady

of the Hon. W. Borlase Warren Vernon, a son.

27. At One Ash, Rochdale, the lady of John Bright, M.P., a daughter.

29. At Tew Park, Oxfordshire, the lady of M. P. W. Boulton, esq., a daughter.

30. In Grosvenor-street, the Viscountess Holmesdale, a son.

31. At Chesterfield House, the Countess of Lichfield, a son and heir.

— At Brighton, the lady of Colonel Kemeys Tynte, M.P., a son.

— At Chetwynd Park, Shropshire, the lady of Burton Borough, esq., a son.

FEBRUARY.

1. At Kilkenny, the Hon. Mrs. Bury, a daughter.

— At Talacre, Flintshire, the Hon. Lady Mostyn, a daughter.

2. At Leytonstone House, the lady of T. Fowell Buxton, esq., a daughter.

4. At Heath House, near Wakefield, the lady of E. A. Leatham, esq., a daughter.

5. At Moulton, in the Punjaub, the lady of Sir Edward Campbell, bart., Capt. H.M.'s 60th Rifles, twin sons.

6. At Longford Rectory, Derbyshire, the lady of the Rev. T. A. Anson, a daughter.

— At Firle Place, Sussex, the Hon. Mrs. Vereker, a daughter.

7. At Sealkote, Punjaub, the lady of Maj.-Gen. J. B. Hearsey, C.B., a son.

8. At Corfu, the lady of Col. Walpole, a daughter.

— At Oxford, Margaret, lady of Dr. Bulley, President of Magdalen, a daughter.

10. At Castle Hill, Viscountess Ebrington, a son.

— At Hethersett Hall, Norfolk, the lady of Henry Back, esq., a daughter.

11. At Berkswell Hall, near Coventry, the lady of the Rev. C. Bickmore, M.A., a daughter.

— At the Deanery, Carlisle, the lady of the Very Rev. the Dean of Carlisle, a daughter.

— At Wakes Colne, Essex, the Hon. Mrs. Francis Grimston, a son.

13. At Aikenhead House, Lanarkshire, the Lady Isabella Gordon, a son.

— In Grosvenor-square, the Lady Louisa Mills, a son.

— At Bishopston, the lady of the Bishop of Argyle, a son.

14. In South Audley-street, the Lady Adelaide Cadogan, a daughter.

— At Ogmiston Hall, N.B., the Hon. Mrs. Dalrymple, a son.

BIRTHS.

14. At Hafton House, Argyllshire, the Hon. Mrs. C. Monteith Hamilton, a son.
15. At Bedwell Park, Herts, Lady Cochrane, a daughter.
16. At Riseholme, Lincoln, the lady of the Bishop of Lincoln, a daughter, still-born.
— At the Rectory of St. George's, Hanover-square, Mrs. Howarth, a daughter.
— At Dunoon Castle, Argyllshire, the lady of R. L. Eglinton, esq., a daughter.
18. At the Royal Naval Hospital, Haslar, the lady of Captain Dacres, C.B., Superintendent, a son.
19. Mary, lady of Isaac Hughes, of Nantsyddion, four children; three girls and one boy.
21. At Kidderminster, the Hon. Mrs. Claughton, a son.
22. At Beaumaris, the lady of Lieut.-Col. C. G. Fagan, a son.
— In Harley-street, the lady of the Rev. Edward Thompson, D.D., Vicar of Kington, Herefordshire, a daughter.
23. In Lowndes-square, the Hon. Mrs. Claude Lyon, a son.
— At Bath, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Charles Moray Macleane, a daughter.
— At Surbiton Hill, Surrey, the lady of James Brotherton, esq., Receiver-General of Inland Revenue, a daughter.
— At Corton Denham, Somersetshire, the Hon. Mrs. Augustus Byron, a son.
26. At Belfast, the lady of Maj.-Gen. Gough, C.B., commanding the Northern District, a daughter.
— At Torquay, the Hon. Mrs. Spring Rice, a daughter.
28. In Brunswick-square, Brighton, Mrs. Bonham, widow of the late Col. H. F. Bonham, a son.
29. At Ramsgate, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Hunter, a son.
7. At Edinburgh, the Lady Louisa Wardlaw Ramsay, a daughter.
8. At Grey Abbey, the Lady Charlotte Montgomery, a son.
— In Eccleston-square, the lady of Capt. H. G. Hamilton, R.N., a son.
9. At Cromarty House, Porchester-terrace, the lady of H. Harwood Harwood, esq., twins, a son and daughter.
10. At Errol Park, N.B., the lady of Sir James Gardiner Baird, Bart., a son.
11. At Higher Ardwick, near Manchester, the lady of the Hon. Thomas Montagu Carrington Wild, a son.
— At Foulmire Rectory, near Royston, the Hon. Mrs. Arthur Savile, a daughter.
13. In Cleveland-terrace, Hyde Park, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Langley, a daughter.
— At Hamborough Rectory, Oxfordshire, the lady of the Rev. Dr. Higgs, a daughter.
14. At Kinnersley Castle, Herefordshire, the lady of Capt. Parkinson, a son.
15. Lady Elizabeth Romilly, a son.
16. At Woodend, the Lady Greenock, a son and heir.
— At Hatherton Hall, Staffordshire, the Hon. Lady Vavasour, a daughter.
19. At Paris, the Lady Ribblesdale, a daughter.
— At Hazlewood Castle, Tadcaster, the lady of G. W. Manley, esq., a son.
21. At Wickham-place, Lady Champion de Crespigny, a daughter.
22. In Sussex-gardens, Hyde Park, the Lady Frederick Kerr, a daughter.
23. In Clifton-place, Hyde Park, the Lady Augusta Kennedy, a son and heir.
— The Hon. Mrs. Spencer Ponsonby, a daughter.
— At Oakley Hall, Hants, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Wallington, a son.
— At Gwysaney Hall, Flintshire, the lady of W. Foster, esq., a daughter.
25. In Lowndes-square, the Hon. Mrs. Adderley, a son.
— At Minster Acres, Northumberland, the Hon. Mrs. Silvertop, a son.
26. At Creebridge House, N.B., Mrs. Edward Heron Maxwell, a son.
— At Badminton, the Duchess of Beaufort, a daughter.
— At Grimston, near Tadcaster, Yorkshire, Lady Londesborough, a son.
27. At Howbury Hall, near Bedford, the lady of Frederick C. Polhill Turner, esq., a daughter.
— At 10, Upper Grosvenor-street, the lady of Edward Majoribanks, esq., jun., a son.

MARCH.

1. In Grosvenor-place, the Lady Alfred Paget, a daughter.
2. At Megginch Castle, Perthshire, the lady of John Murray Drummond, esq., a son and heir.
3. In Audley-square, the Lady Constance Maidstone, a daughter.
4. At Haigh Hall, Wigan, the Hon. Mrs. Lindsay, a daughter.
— At Up Ottery, Devon, the lady of the Hon. W. W. Addington, a daughter.
5. At Tabreez, Persia, the lady of Keith Edward Abbott, esq., her Majesty's Consul, a son.
7. At Eastwood, Dunkeld, N.B., the Lady James Murray, a daughter.

BIRTHS.

27. At Halfod, Cardiganshire, the lady of Sir G. J. Thomas, bart., a son.
 28. In Eaton-place South, the Hon. Mrs. Charles Spring Rice, a son.
 29. At Bradfield, Devon, the Hon. Mrs. Walrond, a daughter.
 — At Greystoke Castle, Cumberland, Mrs. Howard, a daughter.
 — In Rutland Gate, the Countess of Munster, a son and heir.
 30. In Great Stanhope-street, the Hon. Mrs. Cust, a son.
 31. In Eaton-place, Lady Perry, a son.
 — At Sibton Park, Suffolk, the lady of J. W. Brooke, esq., a son and heir.

APRIL.

2. In Craven-place, Hyde Park, the Hon. Mrs. James Augustus Atkinson, a son.
 — At Overbury Court, Worcestershire, the Lady Catherine Berkeley, a son.
 3. At Wenman House, Ryde, I.W., Lady Lees, a daughter.
 6. At Ashley Castle, Warwickshire, the Viscountess Lifford, a son.
 7. In Portland-place, the Lady Augusta Mostyn, a son and heir.
 8. At Packolet, county Down, the lady of Major-Gen. Chesney, a son.
 9. In Curzon-street, Mayfair, Lady Wharncliffe, a son and heir.
 11. At Langley Park, the Marchioness of Chandos, a daughter.
 — At Sufton Court, Herefordshire, the lady of Thomas Evans, esq., a daughter.
 — At Kilpauk, Madras, the lady of Lieut.-Col. H. Marshall, Deputy Secretary to Government, a son.
 12. In Cadogan-place, the Hon. Mrs. Macdonald, of Clanranald, a son.
 13. In Cadogan-place, the lady of Capt. Montgomery, R.N., a daughter.
 15. At Ribston Hall, Wetherley, Yorkshire, the lady of John Dent Dent, esq., M.P., a daughter.
 16. At Turin, the Hon. Mrs. Edward Erskine, a daughter.
 20. In Richmond-terrace, Whitehall, the Countess of Mount Charles, a daughter.
 21. At Beaufort, near Killarney, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Charles E. Law, 66th Regiment, a son and heir.
 — At Harefield, near Southampton, the Lady Edward Thynne, a son, still-born.
 — At Tillington, near Petworth, Lady Tancred, a son.
 26. In Eaton-terrace, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Charles Townsend Wilson, a daughter.

26. At Brookwood Park, Hants, the lady of Col. William Greenwood, a daughter.
 — At Cork, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Arthur J. Pack, a daughter.
 — The lady of Sir Charles Watson, Bart., a daughter.

MAY.

1. At Butleigh Court, the lady of Ralph Neville Grenville, esq., a daughter.
 2. In Upper Southwick-street, the lady of Dr. R. G. Latham, a son.
 3. At Nice, the lady of Sir Edward North Buxton, bart., a daughter.
 4. At Stainforth Hall, near Doncaster, the lady of John Bladworth, esq., a daughter.
 — At Woolwich, the lady of Lieut.-Col. G. J. L. Buchanan, Royal Art., a son.
 — In St. George's-road, Ecclestone-square, the Hon. Mrs. Maude, a daughter.
 6. At Barbados, Mrs. G. Carrington, of Missenden Abbey, Bucks, a son and heir.
 7. In Grosvenor-place, Lady Scott, a daughter.
 9. At Tor House, Tor Point, Cornwall, the lady of Capt. Henry S. Hillyar, R.N., C.B., a son.
 — In Eaton-place, West, Lady Elizabeth Russell, a daughter.
 10. In Gloucester-square, the Hon. Mrs. Kerr, a son.
 — At Richings Park, Bucks, Lady Willshire, a son.
 — At Dublin, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Pattle, 16th Lancers, a daughter.
 12. In Carlton-terrace, Edinburgh, the lady of T. F. L. Livingstone, esq., of Westquarter, a son and heir.
 13. At Exton Park, Rutland, the Hon. Mrs. Henry Noel, a son.
 14. At Jackatalla, Madras Presidency, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Douglas Patten, of the 74th Highlanders, a daughter.
 17. At Brixworth Hall, Northamptonshire, Mrs. Richard Lee Bevan, a son.
 — In Eaton-place, the lady of Lieut.-Col. A. Lowry Cole, C.B., 17th Regt., a daughter.
 — At Holne Park, the lady of Henry B. T. Wrey, esq., a daughter.
 18. At Glynn, Cornwall, Lady Vivian, a son.
 19. In Chesham-place, the Hon. Mrs. Richard Cavendish, a daughter.
 — At Cottesmore Rectory, Rutland, the Hon. Mrs. Andrew Stuart, a daughter.
 — At Glanusk Park, the lady of Alexander Young Spearman, esq., a son.

BIRTHS.

21. At the Rectory, Barford St. Martin, near Salisbury, the lady of the Hon. and Rev. Samuel Waldegrave, a son.

23. At the Newarke, Leicester, the lady of Sir Mylles Cave Browne Cave, bart., a daughter.

24. At Lyndhurst, Lady Margaret Lushington, a son.

29. The Lady Mary Windsor Clive, a daughter.

30. At Box, Wiltshire, the lady of Lt.-Col. Younger, a daughter.

— At Northchurch Rectory, Herts, the wife of the Rev. Sir John H. Culme Seymour, bart., a daughter.

31. At Boulogne-sur-Mer, the Lady Louisa Alexander, a son.

JUNE.

1. At Elford House, Staffordshire, the lady of Colonel Charles Bagot, a son.

2. In Lower Berkeley-street, the Lady Annora Williams-Wynn, a son.

— The lady of Henry Cholmeley, esq., of Brandsby Hall, a son.

4. At Christchurch, Canterbury, New Zealand, the lady of Charles John Perceval, esq., a son.

5. At Pynes, Devon, Lady Northcote, a daughter.

6. At Ingestre, Staffordshire, Viscountess Ingestre, a daughter.

— At Woolwich, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Eardley Wilnot, R.A., a son.

7. At Stanford Rectory, Worcestershire, the lady of the Rev. Edward Winnington Ingram, a son.

— At South Witham Rectory, Lincolnshire, the lady of the Rev. R. W. Lionel Tollemache, a daughter.

— At the Manor House, Little Marlow, Bucks, the lady of George Jackson, esq., a son.

9. In South-street, the Hon. Mrs. Francis Stuart Wortley, a son.

— At Reddington Manor, Notts, the lady of Sir Thomas Parkyns, bart., a daughter.

11. In Belgrave-square, the Lady Louisa Douglas Pennant, a daughter.

— In New Burlington-street, Lady Hulse, a daughter.

12. At Westover, Isle of Wight, the Hon. Mrs. à Court Holmes, a son.

— In Rue des Ecuries d'Artois, Paris, the lady of Major R. Carmichael-Smyth, late of the 93rd Sutherland Highlanders, a son.

— At Lauriston Castle, Edinburgh, the

lady of John C. Craigie Halkett, esq., son.

14. At Orton Longville, the Marchioness of Huntly, a son.

15. In Berkeley-square, the Lady Suffolk, a daughter.

16. At Spain's Hall, Essex, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Ruggles Brise, a daughter.

17. At Cayton Hall, Yorkshire, the Hon. Mrs. Clifton Wilkinson, a son.

— In Inverness-terrace, Bayswater, the lady of Capt. T. V. Anson, R.N., a daughter.

18. In Chesham-street, Belgravia, the lady of Sir Henry St. John Mildmay, bart., a daughter.

— At Tetworth Hall, Huntingdonshire, the lady of John Harvey Astell, esq., a daughter.

— At Thornycroft Hall, Cheshire, the lady of the Rev. John Thornycroft, a son.

— In Sussex-place, Brighton, the Hon. Mrs. Robert Daly, a son.

19. At Monte Video, the lady of Edward Thornton, esq., Her Britannic Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires and Consul-General at Monte Video, a son.

— At Templemore Priory, Templemore, Ireland, Lady Carden, a son.

20. At Rutland Gate, Lady Edward Fitzalan Howard, a daughter.

21. At Inchmarlo, Kincardineshire, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Burnett Ramsay, a daughter.

23. At Bombay, the lady of Sir William Yardley, a daughter.

25. At Dingle Bank, Liverpool, the Hon. Mrs. Edward Cropper, a daughter.

— At the Pavilion, Aldwick, Sussex, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Ansten, a daughter.

26. In Mansfield-street, the lady of C. M. Lushington, esq., M.P., a daughter.

28. At Trafalgar, the Countess Nelson, a son.

— At Guildford, the lady of Capt. Henry Weston, of West Horsley-place, a son.

— In Eaton-square, the Viscountess Malden, a daughter.

29. Mrs. Loftus Tottenham, of Glenade, a son and heir.

30. In Paris, Lady M'Mahon, a son.

JULY.

1. At Aden, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Lowth, of H.M.'s 86th Royal Regt., a son and heir.

3. The lady of Sir Justin Sheil, K.C.B., a son.

BIRTHS.

3. In Queen's-road, Regent's-park, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Lyell, a daughter.

— At Arrowe-park, Cheshire, the lady of John R. Shaw, esq., a son.

5. The Countess of Durham, a son.

— In Ainslie-place, Edinburgh, the Countess of Kintore, a son.

6. In Halkin-street West, the Hon. Mrs. Edward Wingfield, a daughter.

7. In Sussex-square, Hyde Park, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Little, 9th Lancers, a daughter.

— In Bruton-street, the Lady Templemore, a daughter.

8. In Hertford-street, Mayfair, the Lady Charlotte Neville, a son, still-born.

— In Cadogan-place, the lady of H. A. Bruce, esq., M.P., a daughter.

9. In Belgrave-square, the Lady Octavia Shaw Stewart, a son.

10. At Hoveton Hall, Norfolk, the Hon. Mrs. Randall Burroughes, a daughter.

— At Camberwell, Mrs. Charles Moffatt, three daughters.

— At Wymondham Rectory, Leicestershire, the Hon. Mrs. John Beresford, a daughter.

11. At Acton Reynald, Salop, Lady Corbet, a son and heir.

— In Euston-square, the lady of the Rev. James Hamilton, D.D., a daughter.

13. At Pamflete, Devonshire, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Winnington Ingram, a son.

— At Castleton, Monmouthshire, the lady of Sir George Walker, bart., a son.

14. At Ashwell-Thorpe Hall, Norfolk, Lady Tyrwhitt, a son.

15. At Woolwich, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Phillpotts, R.A., a son.

17. At the Rectory, Hertingfordbury, Herts, the lady of the Hon. and Rev. Godolphin Hastings, a son.

18. At the Old Park House, Derbyshire, Lady Anna Chandos Pole, a daughter.

— At Stone Lodge, Suffolk, the Hon. Mrs. George Dashwood, a daughter.

— At Sudbury Hall, Derby, Lady Harriet Vernon, a son.

19. At Brooksby Hall, Leicestershire, the lady of Welles Charlton, esq., a daughter.

21. In Lansdowne-terrace, Notting-hill, the lady of Capt. Craigie, R.N., a son.

22. At Wimbledon Park, the Lady Hermione Graham, a daughter.

23. At Barton House, Canterbury, the lady of Major D'Aguilar, C.B., a daughter.

— At Aldborough Hall, Norfolk, the lady of James Gay, esq., a daughter.

24. At Jersey, the lady of Lieut.-Col. G. Bristow, a son.

25. In Ennismore-place, the Lady Clarence Paget, a daughter.

26. Mrs. Mark Lemon, a daughter.

28. In Charlotte-square, Edinburgh, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Brodie, a son.

29. At Bonlogne, the lady of Capt. Henderson, R.N., a son.

30. The Hon. Mrs. Portman, a son and heir.

AUGUST.

1. In Eaton-square, Lady Troubridge, a daughter.

3. In Westbourne-street, Hyde Park, the lady of Colonel Everest, a son.

— In Cavendish-square, the Lady Catherine Petre, a son.

4. At Thorndon, the Lady Petre, a daughter.

— At Ballinclea House, Dalkey, the lady of the Hon. R. G. Talbot, a son.

— At Croston Hall, Lancashire, the Lady Adelaide de Trafford, a son.

5. At Brafferton Moor, Yorkshire, Lady Payne Gallwey, a daughter.

6. In Chester-square, Lady Mayne, a son.

7. At the Palace, Hampton Court, the Hon. Mrs. William Towry Law, a son.

8. At Carron Hall, Stirlingshire, the lady of Joseph Dundas, esq., a daughter.

9. At Withington Rectory, Gloucestershire, the Hon. Mrs. Gustavus Talbot, a daughter.

10. At the seat of her father, Lord Sherborne, in Gloucestershire, Lady Dunsany, a son.

— At the Rectory, Slaughtam, Sussex, the Hon. Mrs. St. John Paul Methuen, a daughter.

11. In Eaton-place, Lady Colville, of Culross, a daughter.

12. At Efford Manor, Devon, the lady of Capt. the Hon. L. Addington, a son.

14. At Guernsey, the Viscountess Northland, a son.

15. In Princes Gate, the Hon. Mrs. Edward Jervis, a daughter.

18. At Niton, near Amesbury, the lady of Sir Edward Poore, bart., a daughter.

— At Glynde, Sussex, the Hon. Mrs. Brand, a daughter.

19. At Beechwood, Lady Sebright, a son.

— In Queen-square, Westminster, the lady of William Atherton, esq., M.P., a son.

— At Nelson, New Zealand, the lady of Edwin Hare Dashwood, esq., a son.

20. In Berkeley-square, the lady of John Martin, esq., M.P., a daughter.

BIRTHS.

20. At Muirtown House, Inverness, Mrs. Duff, a daughter.

21. At Eserick Park, Lady Wenlock, a son.

22. At Appleton Hall, the lady of Richard Assheton Cross, esq., a son.

23. In Tilney-street, the Viscountess Newark, a son.

— At Hampstead, the Hon. Mrs. Maurice Drummond, a son.

— At Eastwell Park, the Countess of Winchelsea, a son.

— At Boulogne-sur-Mer, the lady of Major-Gen. G. Warren, of the Indian Army, Bengal Presidency, a son.

26. At Strathfieldsaye Rectory, Hants, the lady of the Rev. James Gerald Joyce, a son.

28. At Stirkoke House, Caithness-shire, the lady of Major Horne, of Stirkoke, late Capt. 92nd Highlanders, a son and heir.

29. At Frittenden, the Lady Harriet Moore, a daughter.

— At Stoke Rochford, the Lady Caroline Turnor, a daughter.

— At Westwell House, Tenterden, Kent, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Sandham, Royal Artillery, a son.

30. In Eccleston-terrace, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Evelyn, a daughter.

SEPTEMBER.

1. At Winchester, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Shipley, Royal Fus., a son.

3. At Nettleworth Hall, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Fitz Herbert, a daughter.

— At Woodlands, near Wingham, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Elliot, R.A., a daughter.

— At the Rectory, North Creak, Norfolk, the lady of the Hon. and Rev. T. R. Keppel, a daughter.

— At Wyham Rectory, near Louth, Lincolnshire, the lady of the Rev. F. W. Mann, a daughter.

— Viscountess Forth, a son.

4. In Kensington Palace Gardens, Lady Peto, a daughter.

5. At Ashridge, Herts, the Viscountess Cranley, a daughter.

6. At Rookham Grove, the Viscountess Downe, a daughter.

8. At Oldmixon-super-Valley, Chester County, U.S., the lady of Comm. G. H. Oldmixon, R.N., a son.

9. At Collingwood, the Hon. Mrs. Gordon, a daughter.

12. At Coleshill House, Berks, the lady of the Right Hon. Edward Pleydell Bouverie, M.P., a son.

12. At Corfu, the lady of Lieut.-Col. the Hon. Edward Gage, R.A., a daughter.

13. At Riccarton, Lady Gibson Craig, a daughter.

14. At Versailles, the lady of W. Pollard-Urquhart, esq., M.P., a daughter.

— At Malta, the Hon. Mrs. Augustus Lane Fox, a son.

15. At Fornham Hall, the Lady Manners, a son.

16. At Hendon, Middlesex, the lady of Capt. Stanley, R.N., a daughter.

— At Dinnington Hall, Yorkshire, the lady of Captain Walter, a daughter.

17. The Marchioness of Winchester, a daughter, still-born.

18. At Auckland, New Zealand, the lady of his Excellency Col. Gore Brown, a son.

20. At Averad, Galway, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Gaisford, a son.

22. At Moorhurst, near Dorking, the lady of Capt. Heath, R.N., C.B., a daughter.

23. In Eaton-square, Lady Claud Hamilton, a son.

24. At Kissowlie, E.I., the lady of Colonel Inglis, H. M.'s 32nd Regiment, a son.

25. In Grosvenor-street, Lady Smith, of Sutton, a daughter.

— At Villa Nova, Barbadoes, the lady of the Rev. Henry H. Parry, son of the Lord Bishop of the Diocese, a son.

— At Woolwich, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Burrows, R.A., a son.

26. At Leamington, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Sullivan, Royal Scots Greys, a son.

27. In Park-crescent, Portland-place, the lady of Lieut.-Col. P. C. Cavan, a son.

— At Arborfield Hall, Berks, the lady of Thomas Hargreaves, esq., a daughter.

28. At the Lord Chief Baron's, Guildford-street, Lady Pollock, a daughter.

29. At Maidstone, the lady of Captain Hon. Chas. Powys, 9th Lancers, a daughter.

30. In Brook-street, Grosvenor-square, the Lady Bateman, a son and heir.

OCTOBER.

2. At Longford, Salop, the Lady Hester Leeke, a son.

— At Fox Holes, Lancashire, the lady of John Smith Entwisle, esq., a son and heir.

3. At Southsea, the lady of Comm. Furneaux, R.N., H.M.S. Vulcan, a son.

— At Acton Burnell, Shropshire, the Hon. Lady Smythe, a daughter.

4. At Henstead Hall, Suffolk, the lady of T. B. Sherriffe, esq., a daughter.

BIRTHS.

4. At Devonport, the lady of Capt. Sir William Parker, bart., a daughter.

5. At Tunbridge Wells, Lady Frances Petteward, a daughter.

7. The lady of Dr. Lankester, F.R.S., Saville-row, a daughter.

9. At West Park, Elgin, the Hon. Mrs. Lewis Grant, of Grant, a son.

— At Sherridge House, near Worcester, the Hon. Mrs. Norbury, a daughter.

— At Laverstoke House, Hants, the Lady Charlotte Portal, a son and heir.

11. At Waverley Abbey, the lady of Capt. W. S. Nicholson, a daughter.

— At Blithfield, Staffordshire, Lady Constance Grosvenor, a daughter.

12. At the Manor House, Little Shelford, the lady of the Rev. J. E. Law, a daughter.

13. At Brighton, the Marchioness of Abercorn, a son.

14. At Wollaton, the Hon. Mrs. Campbell, a daughter.

— At Lomore House, Herefordshire, the lady of W. Y. Peel, esq., a son.

— At Boulogne-sur-Mer, the Hon. Mrs. Henry Graves, a son.

17. At Stobo Castle, the lady of Sir G. Montgomery, bart., M.P., a daughter.

18. At White Place, Berks, the lady of Henry Hammer Leicester, esq., a son.

— At Sale Hall, Cheshire, the lady of John Peel, esq., a son.

— In Thurloe-square, the Lady Beaujolois Dent, a daughter.

— At Edinburgh, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Moody, R.E., a son.

19. At Grove House, West Cowes, Isle of Wight, the Hon. Mrs. Petre, a son.

20. At Richmond, the lady of Arthur Otway, esq., M.P., a daughter.

— In Lower Seymour-street, the lady of Col. Birch Reynardson, C.B., a daughter.

— In Dorchester-place, Blandford-sq. (for the fourth time of twins), the lady of E. M. Williams, esq., twin daughters.

21. In Brunswick-square, Brighton, the Lady Lurgan, a son and heir.

23. At Oxford, the Hon. Mrs. Hall, a son.

— At the Lodge, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, the lady of the Rev. James Pulling, D.D., a daughter.

24. At Cavendish Hall, Suffolk, the lady of S. T. Yelloly, esq., a son.

25. At Redgrave Hall, Suffolk, the lady of Maurice Johnson, esq., a daughter.

26. At Princes Gate, the Hon. Mrs. Hubbard, a daughter.

27. At the Observatory, Beeston, near Nottingham, the lady of E. J. Lowe, esq., F.R.A.S., a son.

30. In Grove End-road, the lady of Capt. R. A. Oliver, R.N., a son.

— At Sunbury, Middlesex, the lady of W. D. Christie, esq., H.B.M. Minister Plenipotentiary to the Argentine Confederation, a daughter.

— The Hon. Mrs. Henry Taylor, a daughter.

— At Osberton, Lady Gertrude Foljambe, a son and heir.

31. At Richmond, Surrey, the lady of Lieut.-Col. W. L. Mellish, a son.

NOVEMBER.

2. At Houghton House, Bedfordshire, the lady of Humphrey Brandreth, esq., a son and heir.

3. In Devonshire-place, the Hon. Mrs. Proctor Beauchamp, a son.

— At Moncrieffe House, Perthshire, the Lady Louisa Moncrieffe, a son.

4. At Knowsley Parsonage, Lancashire, the Hon. Mrs. W. L. Fielden, a son.

— At Ince Blunden Hall, Lancashire, the lady of T. Weld Blundell, esq., a son.

— The lady of John Henry Walker, esq., of Marpool, Devon, and of Packwood, Warwickshire, a son and heir.

— At Carew's Wood, county of Cork, the lady of Edmund W. Meade Waldo, jun., esq., a daughter.

5. At the Rectory, Great Stanmore, Lady Ellen Gordon, a daughter.

— At Southsea, the lady of Capt. Brenton von Donop, R.N., a son.

6. At the Headlands, Prestwich, near Manchester, the lady of James Heywood, esq., M.P., a son.

9. At St. Petersburg, the Lady Wodehouse, a son.

— At Devonport, the lady of Capt. Dawson, 93rd Highlanders, a daughter.

12. At 68, Eccleston-square, the lady of Charles William Curtis, esq., a daughter.

14. At Stonehouse, Devon, the lady of Lieut.-Col. J. Mitchell, a daughter.

18. At Louth, the Lady Albinia A. Pye, a daughter.

— At the Rectory, Welwyn, Herts, Lady Boothby, a son and heir.

19. At Gloucester-square, the lady of Francis Scully, esq., M.P., a son.

— The Hon. Mrs. Robert Herbert, of Upper Grosvenor-street, a son.

20. In Blacket-place, Edinburgh, the lady of Major-Gen. Cavaye, Bombay Army, a son.

21. At Exmouth, the lady of Capt. T. M. C. Symonds, C.B., R.N., a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

21. Lady Meux, a son.
— In South-street, the Lady Adeliza Manners, a daughter.
22. At Fife Keith, Banffshire, Lady Bertha Clifton, a daughter.
— At Southsea, the lady of Capt. the Hon. F. T. Pelham, R.N., a daughter.
24. In the Esplanade, Plymouth, the Hon. Mrs. D. Hay, a daughter.
— At Woolwich, the lady of Col. Edward Warde, Royal Horse Artillery, a son.
— In Belgrave-square, the lady of Adm. Sir Thomas Cochrane, a son.
25. At the Royal Hospital, Dublin, the lady of Col. Robert Wood, a daughter.
— In Lower Brook-street, the Marchioness of Blandford, a son.
— At Roundhay Lodge, near Leeds, the Hon. Mrs. Denison, a son.
— At Mallegaum, East Indies, the lady of Lt.-Col. Herbert Jacob, a daughter.
27. In Grosvenor-square, the Hon. Mrs. Creswell, a son.
— In Charlotte-square, Edinburgh, the lady of Col. Burn, R.A., a son.
29. In Warwick-villas, Paddington, the lady of Lieut.-Col. H. Stamford, a daughter.

DECEMBER.

3. At Milliken, Renfrewshire, Lady Milliken Napier, a son.
4. At Portobello, near Edinburgh, Lady Campbell, of Barcaldine, a son.
5. At the Cloisters, Windsor Castle, the lady of Dr. G. Elvey, a son.
— In Eaton-square, the lady of the Rev. Theodosius W. Boughton-Leigh, a daughter.
6. At Pau, the Right Hon. Lady Elbank, a son.
7. At Ryall Hall, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Cautley, a son.
9. In Chapel-street, Grosvenor-square, the Hon. Mrs. Francis Stonor, a son.
— At Woodlands Cottage, near Havant, the lady of Capt. Coles, R.N., a son.
10. At Stoneleigh Abbey, Lady Leigh, a son.
— At Birr, Ireland, the lady of Col. Crutchley, a son.
11. At the Deanery, Southampton, the lady of Archdeacon Wigram, a son.
— In Eaton-square, the Lady Jane Levett, a son and heir.
12. At Carlisle, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Erskine, a son.
13. In Upper Church-street, Bath, the lady of Capt. Nias, R.N., C.B., a son.
14. The lady of Lieut.-Col. Every-

Clayton, of Carr Hall, near Burnley, Lancashire, a son.

14. At the Old Court, Tortworth, Wotton-under-Edge, the Hon. Mrs. Percy Moreton, a daughter.

15. At Eglington Hall, near Alnwick, the lady of Robert Ogle, jun., esq., a daughter.

18. In Carlton-gardens, the Hon. Mrs. James Stuart Wortley, a daughter.

— At Melton Mowbray, the Lady Frances Lloyd, a daughter.

— In Eaton-place, the Hon. Mrs. James Drummond, a daughter.

19. In Piccadilly, the Lady Margaret Beaumont, a daughter.

20. In Chester-square, the lady of John George Phillimore, esq., Q.C., M.P., a son.

21. At Kimmel Park, the Hon. Mrs. Hughes, a daughter.

24. At Grant Lodge, Elgin, N.B., Louisa Countess of Seafield, lady of Major Godfrey Massey, Unattached, a son.

25. At the Bedfords, West Ham, Essex, the lady of Capt. Pelly, R.N., a son.

26. At Kempston Hoo, Bedfordshire, the lady of Talbot Barnard, esq., High Sheriff of the county, a son.

29. In Lowndes-square, the Hon. Mrs. Harvie Farquhar, a son.

30. The Viscountess Folkestone, a son.

MARRIAGES.

JANUARY.

1. At Rochdale, Samuel Crompton, esq., to Harriet, daughter of the Rev. J. E. N. Molesworth, D.D.

— At Little Stanmore, Middlesex, Harry Smith Parkes, esq., H. M.'s Consul at Amoy, China, to Fanny Hannah, daughter of the late Thomas Hall Plumer, esq.

— At Sithney, Capt. Hender John Molesworth St. Aubyn, Royal Miners Artillery, to Kythe Catharine, daughter of C. Wallis Popham, esq., of Trevarno, and niece of Sir R. R. Vyvyan, bart., M.P.

2. At St. Peter's Church, Plymouth, Lieut. Charles Harry Wilson, 41st Madras Infantry, to Francesca Henrietta, daughter of the late Rear-Admiral Sir Thomas Fellowes, K.T., C.B.

— At St. Marylebone Church, Captain John Lort Stokes, R.N., to Louisa French, relict of Henry John Garratt, esq.

— At the Cathedral, Bombay, Mark Style, esq., to Marian Jervis White Jervis, daughter of Sir Henry Jervis, bart.

MARRIAGES.

3. At Hurtspierpoint, John George Dodson, esq., only son of the Right Hon. Sir John Dodson, to Caroline Florence, daughter of W. J. Campion, esq.

— At St. Peter's, Pimlico, Salisbury, J. Baxendale, esq., to Edith Marian, daughter of Lieut.-Gen. Sir Harry Jones, K.C.B.

8. At Gordon-square, S. Rawson Gardiner, esq., eldest son of Rawson Boddam Gardiner, esq., of Gordon-street, Gordon-square, to Isabella, daughter of the late Rev. Edward Irving.

— In Dublin, Sir Bernard Burke, Ulster King of Arms, to Barbara Frances, daughter of the late James MacEvoy, esq.

— At Melplish, Dorset, the Rev. Thomas Duodecimus Hall, second son of the Hon. Baron Platt, to Selina, daughter of the Rev. Edward Drury Butts.

9. At the Catholic Chapel, Spanish-place, Francis Scully, esq., M.P., to Clotilde, daughter of John Samuel Moorat, esq.

— At the Cathedral, Calcutta, F. Gore Willock, esq., 6th Regt. Bengal Light Cav., to Matilda, widow of the late Major M'Kean.

10. At Stoke, Devonport, the Hon. Robert Handcock, second son of Lord Castlemaine, to Caroline, daughter of Col. Pester, Roy. Art.

— The Dowager Marchioness Townshend, to James, eldest son of James Laidler, esq., Fenton, Northumberland.

— At Stoke, F. J. Colhoun Wilson, of the H.E.I.C.S., eldest son of the late Lieut.-Gen. Wilson, C.B., to Annie, daughter of the late O. W. Span, esq., of Trinidad.

— At Monks Kirby, Warwickshire, Capt. Levett, First Life Guards, to the Lady Jane Fielding, daughter of the Earl of Denbigh.

17. At Tirlé, Col. the Hon. Edward Gage, younger son of Viscount Gage, to Arabella, daughter of the late Hon. Wm. Gage.

— At Rushford, Norfolk, W. S. Spenser Stanhope, esq., to Elizabeth Julia Buxton, daughter of the late Sir John Jacob Buxton.

— At Clifton, F. G. Davidson, esq., to Annie, daughter of the late Sir G. Henry Freeling, bart.

— At the Royal Chapel, Whitehall, Sir Robert Peel, bart., to Lady Emily Hay, daughter of the Marquis of Tweeddale.

19. At Kilbrin Church, W. N. Barry, esq., to Elizabeth, daughter of the late Sir W. Wrixon Beecher, bart.

— At Paris, in the Chapel of the British Embassy, Sir Henry Meux, bart., M.P., to Louisa Caroline, daughter of the Right Hon. Lord Ernest Bruce, M.P.

21. At Nice, Major George Brydges Rodney, Royal Marines, to Isabella Elizabeth, daughter of Major-General Marcus Beresford.

24. At St. Nicholas, Glamorganshire, the Hon. Windham H. Wyndham Quin, late of the Grenadier Guards, to Caroline, daughter of Admiral Sir George Tyler, of Cottrell, M.P.

28. At Ootacamund, Nielgherries, Lieut. H. Ernest Thesiger Williams, esq., 3rd Madras Europ. Regt., to Ellen Henrietta, daughter of Major-Gen. Dowker, Madras Army.

29. At Sherborne, Gloucestershire, Lady Georgiana Moreton, daughter of the late Earl of Ducie, to the Rev. C. E. Oakley.

— At the Royal Chapel of St. George, Windsor, Captain Frederic Sayer, of the 23rd Royal Welsh Fusil., to Maria Henrietta Sophia, daughter of Col. the Hon. C. B. and Mrs. Phipps.

31. At St. George's, Hanover-square, Col. William Newton, Coldstream Guards, to Elizabeth Louisa, daughter of Lady Elizabeth Steele and the late Major-Gen. Thomas Steele.

— At Richmond, Yorkshire, the Rev. J. Sharpe, Vicar of Doncaster, and Canon of York, to Annie, daughter of Edward Mason, esq.

— At St. Paul's, Kersall Moor, the Rev. Frederic Colborne Fisher, to Rosamond Adelin, daughter of W. L. Clowes, esq.

— At Charlton Church, Kent, Col. Burn, Royal Art., to Caroline Mary Rosdew Little, daughter of Major Little, Royal Marines.

— At Marylebone, H. R. Goldfinch, esq., of Lincoln's Inn, to Emily Reynolds, daughter of S. Reynolds Solly, esq.

FEBRUARY.

2. At St. George's, Hanover-square, Capt. Robb, R.N., of H.M.S. *Cæsar*, to Mary Anne, daughter of the late M. R. Boulton, esq.

5. Lieut.-Col. Nigel F. Kingscote, C.B., M.P., to Lady Emily Marie Curson, daughter of Earl Howe.

— At St. Nicholas, Edw. Priest Richards, esq., of Plasnewyd, Glamorganshire, to Harriet Georgina, daughter of Admiral Sir George Tyler, M.P.

— At St. Peter's Church, Eaton-square, Captain the Hon. J. Drummond, R.N., C.B., to C. F. Elliot, daughter of Admiral the Hon. George Elliot.

MARRIAGES.

7. At Northrepps, Philip Hamond, esq., of Annesley Park, Notts, to Richenda, daughter of the late Sir T. Fowell Buxton, bart., of Northrepps Hall, Norfolk.

14. At St. James's Church, Paddington, Albert George Sandeman, esq., to Maria Charlotta Perpetua de Moraes Sarmento, daughter of the late Viscount da Torre de Moncorvo.

16. At St. George's Chapel, Stonehouse, Devon, Capt. Symonds, R.N., C.B., H.M.S. Conqueror, to Prestwood Mary, daughter of the late Captain Thomas Wolrige, R.N.

19. At Christ Church, Cheltenham, Capt. Portal, 4th Light Drag., to Eliza, daughter of the late Lt.-Gen. Taylor, C.B.

20. At St. Jude's Church, Southsea, Lieut. Norman B. Bedingfield, of the Royal Yacht Victoria and Albert, to Catherine Caledonia, daughter of Capt. James G. Gordon, R.N.

— Henry Bromley, esq., eldest son of Admiral Sir Robert Hoare Bromley, bart., to Georgiana Ellen, daughter of Vere Fane, esq.

23. At Cork, Daniel F. Leahy, esq., J.P., of Shannakiel House, county Cork, to Mary, only daughter of W. T. Fagan, esq., M.P.

— At St. George's, Bloomsbury, Major W. Windham Lukin, Royal Art., to Blanche, daughter of Henry Wakefield, esq.

28. At Tottenhall, Capt. Evans, Roy. Art., to Sarah, only daughter of R. Evans, esq.

MARCH.

1. At Hove Church, near Brighton, Capt. Sir George Hector Leith, bart., of Ross, Dumbartonshire, 17th Lancers, to Ella Maria, daughter of David Barclay Chapman, esq.

— At St. Pancras, J. Plomer Lemon, esq., of Rejarden House, Cornwall, to Henrietta, daughter of the late Capt. George, R.N.

— H. Augustus George, esq., of Ashprington, Devon, to Mary Tyacke, daughter of the late James Lemon, esq.

— At St. Thomé Church, Madras, Lieut. E. T. W. Price, 30th Regt. M.N.I., to Georgina Caroline, second daughter of the late Capt. A. Davies, R.N., and grand-niece of Admiral Horatio, first Viscount Nelson.

3. At St. Martin's Church, Guernsey, George Smith, Esq., 79th Highlanders, of Otterington House, near Northallerton, Yorkshire, to Wilhelmina Maria, only child of the late Capt. W. Le M. Tupper, Royal Welsh Fusiliers.

6. At St. Mary's, Bryanston-square, Charles Raleigh Knight, esq., to Julia Sophia Sadleir Hickson, daughter of the late W. Sadleir Bruere, esq., and relict of the late R. Hickson, esq.

8. At Kensington, the Hon. Robert Rainey Best, to Maria Addison Swaysland, youngest daughter of the late T. A. Swaysland, esq.

11. At Trinity Church, Capt. Cowper Phipps Coles, R.N., to Emily, daughter of the late Henry S. Pearson, esq.

12. At St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Edinburgh, Eneas W. Macintosh, esq., of Raigmore, to Grace Ellen Augusta, youngest daughter of the late Sir Neil Menzies, of that Ilk, bart.

15. At St. George's, Hanover-square, William Rose, esq., to the Hon. Sophia M. A. Thelluson, daughter of Lord Rendlesham.

— At St. George's, Hanover-square, A. Walter Turner, esq., Assistant Commissary-General, to Mary Morgan, daughter of the Hon. Charles Dewey Day, Senior Judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, Montreal.

— At St. James's Church, Lieut. Anguish Honour Augustus, to Emma Eliza, youngest daughter of Edward Lord, esq.

20. At Berhampore, George Maver Jackson, esq., to Agnes Hillcocks, daughter of the late, and sister of the present Sir John Wemyss, bart.

24. At Nice, Harry Chester, esq., of Highgate, and the Privy Council Office, to Henrietta Mary, daughter of Geo. Goff, esq.

— At St. John's Church, Cambridge-square, W. Knox Wigram, esq., of Lincoln's Inn, to the Hon. Mary Pomeroy, daughter of the Viscount Harberton.

25. At All Souls' Church, Langham-place, Sir Thomas Whichcote, bart., of Aswarby, Lincolnshire, to Isabella Elizabeth, daughter of the late Sir Henry C. Montgomery, bart.

— At Bournemouth, the Rev. George Mason, of Alfrington, Devon, to Ellen Mary, daughter of Maj.-Gen. Jones.

— At St. John's Episcopal Chapel, Edinburgh, Adam D. Dundas, esq., to Charlotte Maria, daughter of the late Rear-Admiral Charles Hope.

— At Serlby, Harworth, the Rev. Thomas John Monson, Vicar of Kirby Fleetham, to the Hon. Caroline Isabella Monckton, daughter of the late Viscount Galway.

26. At the Red River, N.W. America, the Rev. H. George, of Christ Church, Cumberland Station, to Mary Ann, elder daughter of the Ven. Archdeacon Cockran.

MARRIAGES.

27. At the Abbey Church, Bath, the Hon. Frederick John Hobart, second son of the Earl of Buckinghamshire, to Catharine Annesley, daughter of the Right Rev. Bishop Carr.

— At St. Alphege, Greenwich, the Rev. Edward Huntingford, D.C.L., to Lydia Christina, second daughter of Admiral Sir James A. Gordon, G.C.B., Governor of Greenwich Hospital.

— At St. Helena, Sir George Jackson, K.C.H., H. M. Commissioner at St. Paul de Loanda, to Catherine Hannah Charlotte Jackson Elliott.

28. At Corfu, in the Palace Chapel, Sir George Ferguson Bowen, K.C.M.G., Secretary to the Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands, to the Countess Diamantina, daughter of his Highness Count Candiano de Roma, G.C.M.G., President of the Ionian Senate.

29. At St. George's Church, Hanover-square, Charles Stirling Dundas, esq., to Mary Lonisa, eldest daughter of Sir Norton and Lady Knatchbull, of Mersham Hatch, Kent.

APRIL.

2. At Stone Church, Peter Broughton, jun., esq., of Tunstall Hall, near Market Drayton, to Florence, daughter of Swynfen Jervis, esq.

3. At St. James's Church, Piccadilly, Capt. G. G. Walker, to Anne Murray, daughter of Admiral Lennox.

— At Haileybury, Thomas Borron Myers, esq., to Margaret Storie, second daughter of the Rev. Henry Melville, B.D., Principal of the East India College, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.

— At St. Mary Abbot's, Kensington, Lieut. George Reid Lempiere, Roy. Eng., to Jane H. Morgan, second daughter of Lieut.-Col. Anderson.

— At St. Mary's, Bryanstone-square, Sir William Carpenter Rowe, Chief Justice of Ceylon, to Frances Elizabeth, youngest daughter of James Hamilton Storey, esq.

— At St. Peter's, Eaton-square, the Lady Rachel Russell, youngest daughter of the late Duke of Bedford, to Lord James Wandesford Butler.

— At St. James's, Piccadilly, the Ven. J. Sandford, B.D., Archdeacon of Coventry, to Anna, widow of the second Baron Erskine.

8. At St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, George E. Biber, esq., to the Hon. J. Berry Erskine, daughter of the late Lord Cardross.

8. At Stella, Capt. Nugent Chichester Nagle, 7th Dragoon Guards, to Amelia Mary, eldest daughter of Joseph Lamb, esq., of Axwell Park.

— At Babraham Church, the Rev. Thomas Erskine, Rector of Steppingley, to Emmeline Augusta, third surviving daughter of the late Henry John Adeane, esq.

— At St. Pancras Church, the Rev. J. Dawson Peake, of Kirkby Lathorpe, Lincolnshire, to Lavinia Elizabeth, eldest daughter of the late Charles Nevill, esq., and Lady Georgiana Nevill.

9. At St. George's, Hanover-square, the Viscount Somerton, eldest son of the Earl of Normanton, to Caroline, daughter of Viscount Barrington.

10. At Rostherne, Cheshire, John Lubbock, esq., eldest son of Sir John William Lubbock, bart., to Ellen Frances, only child of the late Rev. Peter Hordern.

15. At St. Mark, St. Marylebone, William Wreford Major, esq., to Mary, eldest daughter of the late Sir Thomas Noon Talfourd, knight.

— At St. George's, Hanover-square, Lieut.-Col. W. Frederick Johnstone, late of the Grenadier Guards, to the Lady Eleanor Featherstonhaugh.

— At St. John's Church, Paddington, Sir Willoughby Jones, bart., of Cranmer Hall, Norfolk, to Emily, daughter of Henry T. Jones, esq., and Lady Hardinge.

— At St. George's, Hanover-square, Col. T. G. Harriott, of Grove House, Twickenham, to Mary Ann, widow of the late Rev. F. Ford.

17. At All Souls', Langham-place, Charles M'Garel, esq., of Maghermorne, County Antrim, and of Wimpole-street, to Mary Rosina, daughter of Sir James Weir Hogg, bart., M.P.

22. At Peshawur, Capt. Charles Dumbleton, 10th Reg. Light Cav., to Elizabeth F. J., daughter of Major-Gen. T. Read, C.B.

24. At St. James's Church, Francis W. H. Cavendish, esq., to the Lady Elinor Fitzgibbon, daughter of the Earl of Clare.

— At Monreith, Robert Hathorn Johnston Stewart, esq., of Straitton and Champfleurie, to Anne Murray, daughter of Sir William Maxwell, bart.

— At St. George's, Hanover-square, Sir Frederick Arthur, bart., to the Lady Elizabeth Hay.

— The Hon. John Twisleton Fiennes, eldest son of the Lord Saye and Sele, to the Lady Augusta Hay.

26. At All Saints', Fulham, Bonamy

MARRIAGES.

Mansell Power, esq., to Elizabeth, Lady Panmure.

26. At St. George's, Hanover-square, Colonel Goulburn, Grenadier Guards, of Betchworth House, Surrey, to Maria Louisa, daughter of the late Rev. William Tower.

28. At Gouville, Jersey, Captain Astley Cooper Key, R.N., C.B., of H.M.S. Sanspareil, to Charlotte Lavinia, daughter of Edmund A. McNeill, esq.

29. At St. James's Church, Paddington, John T. Campbell, esq., to Anne Katharine Lindesay Bethune, daughter of the late Major-Gen. Sir Henry Bethune, bart.

— At Stirling, the Hon. George Frederick Boyle, son of the late Earl of Glasgow, to the Hon. Montagu Abercromby, only daughter of the late Lord Abercromby.

30. At the Collegiate Church, Southwell, Notts, William Ernest De Veuille, esq., to Eliza Anne, daughter of the late Vickers Jacob, esq., H.E.I.C.S.

— At Totteridge Church, R. C. L. Bevan, esq., of Trent Park, Middlesex, to Emma Frances, daughter of the late Dr. Shuttleworth, Bishop of Chichester.

— At Monkstown, near Dublin, Capt. James Herbert Freme, late of H.M.'s 79th Highlanders, to Lady Anna Maria Isabella, daughter of the Earl of MountCashell.

MAY.

1. At Melbourne, Thomas Frederick Bolton, esq., to Ellen, daughter of George Briscoe, esq.

3. At the Mahableswar Hills, Bombay Presidency, Professor Sinclair, LL.D., to Mary Elizabeth, daughter of the late John T. Robinson, esq.

6. At Bath, the Rev. Henry G. Tierney Elton, to Georgiana Flora, daughter of Captain W. A. Willis, R.N.

— At Elstree, Herts, Capt. Sir Arthur Halkett, of Pitfirrane, bart., 3rd Light Drags., to Eliza Anna, eldest daughter of the late Capt. R. Kirwan Hill, 52nd Regt.

— At Upway, Dorset, R. N. Taylor, esq., of the 17th Madras N.I., to Frances Ann Bentley, the only daughter of Archdeacon Buckle.

9. At St. Peter's Church, Eaton-square, Hugh MacCalmont Cairns, esq., M.P., to Mary Harriett, daughter of the late John McNeile, esq.

10. At St. Peter's, Eaton-square, Robert Needham Cust, son of the Hon. and Rev. Henry and Lady Anna Maria Cust, to Maria Adelaide, daughter of the late Hon.

and Very Rev. Henry Lewis Hobart, D.D., Dean of Windsor.

14. At St. Mary's Church, Marylebone, Capt. H. Gore Lindsay, Rifle Brigade, to Ellen Sarah, fourth daughter of Sir Charles and Lady Morgan.

15. At Higham, Suffolk, Capt. Thomas George Forbes, R.N., to Elizabeth, widow of the late Lieut. Dawson, R.N., and daughter of the late R. Gresley, esq.

— At Walcot Church, Bath, the Rev. Henry Wood, M.A., to Isabella Matilda, daughter of the late John Payne Elwes, esq., of Stoke College, Suffolk.

17. At St. Peter's Church, Eaton-square, Mr. Justice Willes, to Helen, daughter of the late Thomas Jennings, esq.

20. At Tunbridge Wells, the Hon. W. D. Damer, to Julia, daughter of the late Capt. S. Hopkinson, R.N.

21. At Kaiapoi, Canterbury Settlement, New Zealand, George Leslie Lee, esq., of Highfield Amuri, to Maria, second daughter of Lieut.-Col. Fuller, C.B.

22. At Middleton-in-Teesdale, Archibald Hamilton Cochrane, esq., of Langton Grange, Durham, to Rose, daughter of the late G. P. Hutchinson, esq.

— At Wyke Regis, Col. Cockraft, to Annie J. Payne, daughter of the late Adm. Payne.

29. At St. George's, Hanover-square, Captain William John Legh, esq., 21st Fusiliers, to Emily Jane, daughter of the Rev. Canon and Lady Jane Wodehouse.

JUNE.

3. At Leckhampton, Marcus Lowther, esq., Lieut. R.N., to Emily, widow of Count Maximilian de Lerchendorf, and daughter of the late Isaac Cookson, esq.

4. At Regent-terrace, Edinburgh, Lieut. William George Grove, 32nd Regt. Madras N.I., to Sarah, younger daughter of the late J. Gray, esq.

— At Hothfield, Kent, Capt. Thomas Leslie, to Annie, only daughter of Sir Edward and Lady Hoare.

— At Hunmanby, William Amhurst Tysson Amhurst, esq., of Didlington Park, Norfolk, to Margaret Susan Mitford, only child of Rear-Adm. Mitford.

5. M. Theobald, esq., of Aller Cottage, Highgate Rise, to Ellen, daughter of Edward Miall, esq., M.P.

— At St. George's, Hanover-square, James Henry Orde, esq., to Margaret Barclay, daughter of Daniel Gurney, esq., and the late Lady Harriet Gurney.

10. At St. John's Church, Paddington, Lord Forester to Lady Melbourne.

— At St. Alphage, Greenwich, George Moubray Lys, Lieut.-Col. 48th Regt., to Charlotte Louisa, daughter of the late Charles Samuel Goodwyn, esq.

— At High Beech, Essex, John Cochran Hoseason, esq., Comm. R.N., to Augusta Harriet Mary, only surviving daughter of the late Adm. the Right Hon. Sir George Cockburn, bart., G.C.B.

11. At St. George's, Hanover-square, T. Pilkington Dawson, esq., of Groton House, Suffolk, to Emma Anne, daughter of James King King, esq., M.P.

— At Essex-street Chapel, Joseph Crook, esq., M.P., Chamber Hall, near Bolton, to Mary, daughter of Thomas Biggs, esq.

12. At Thwaite's Chapel, Joseph Stonehewer Scott Chad, esq., of Thursford and Pinckney, Norfolk, to Edith Elizabeth, daughter of J. J. Rawlinson, esq.

— At St. Stephen's Church, Dublin, William Nevin Wallace, esq., to Catherine Mary, daughter of the late Capt. the Hon. F. C. Annesley, R.N.

14. At St. James's, Paddington, Lieut.-Colonel Alexander Mednyanszky, of Inverness-road, Hyde Park, to Anna Margaret, eldest daughter of the late G. Birkbeck, M.D.

— At Trinity Church, Newport, Rhode Island, Randolph Latimer, esq., of Baltimore, Maryland, to Mary Elizabeth, eldest daughter of the late Rear-Adm. Ralph Randolph Wormeley.

16. Henry Barnard, Comm. R.N., to Isabel, widow of the late D. H. Webb, esq.

17. At St. Margaret's, Westminster, Charles Wriothesly Digby, esq., of Meriden Hall, Warwickshire, to Adelaide, daughter of the Right Hon. G. Bankes, M.P.

— At Spratton, Northamptonshire, the Rev. Henry Clarke Mitchenson, M.A., of King Edward's Grammar School, East Retford, to Emma Maria, daughter of the late Major Franklin, of the 1st Bengal Cav., and niece of the late Rear-Adm. Sir John Franklin.

18. At Thelbridge, Devonshire, the Rev. Joseph Haskoll, M.A., Canon of Perth, to Anne Caroline, only daughter of the late Hon. H. D. Erskine, and granddaughter of the Earl of Mar.

19. At Watlington, Kent, James Frederick Webster, esq., to Rosaline Sarah, second daughter of Lieut.-Col. Agnew Champain.

19. At Great Chart Church, Kent, the Rev. J. A. Ogle, M.A., to Henrietta Agneta, daughter of the Hon. and Very Rev. G. Pellew, D.D.

23. At St. Marylebone Church, William Augustus Chaplin, esq., to Harriet, daughter of the late Thomas Tonge Vallance, esq.

— At the British Consulate, Boulogne-sur-Mer, and afterwards at the Upper Town Church, Arthur Chichester Crookshank, esq., to Bertha Jane, youngest daughter of the late Rev. Allen Whitmore Lechmere.

24. At St. John's Church, Paddington, the Rev. William Knight, Rector of Steven-ton, Southampton, to Lady Hope, relict of the late Lieut.-Gen. Sir John Hope, G.C.H.

25. At the Catholic Chapel, Holme, on Spalding Moor, Sir James George Fitzgerald, bart., of Castle Ishen, Cork, to Blanch Mary, daughter of the Hon. Philip and Mrs. Stourton.

— At St. Peter's, Eaton-square, Herbert Lowther Wilson, esq., eldest son of Sir John Morillyon Wilson, C.B. and K.H., to Emma Louisa, only daughter of the late Benjamin Goad, esq.

26. At Marylebone Church, Charles Hay Frewen, esq., M.P., to Frances, widow of the late Musgrave Brisco, esq., M.P., and daughter of the late Henry Woodgate, esq.

— At Little Torrington, E. W. Brydges Willyams, esq., to Jane, youngest daughter of Sir Trevor Wheler, bart.

JULY.

1. At St. George's, Hanover-square, Francis Henry Beaumont, esq., of Buckland, Surrey, to Mary Emily, daughter of Evan Baillie, esq., and Lady Georgiana Baillie.

— At the Church of St. Andrew, Dublin, Robert D. Lyons, to Marie Pigot, daughter of the Right Hon. the Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer in Ireland.

3. At St. George's, Hanover-square, Marmaduke Gerard Grimston, esq., to Florence Victoria, daughter of Col. and Lady Maria Saunderson.

— At Tawstock, the Rev. R. Fayle, to Eleanora Elizabeth Savile, relict of the late A. Savile, esq., and sister of Sir Bouchier Palke Wrey, bart.

— At the British Embassy, Paris, Lt.-Col. Graydon, R.A., to Ann Elizabeth, daughter of James Rolleston, esq., Comm. R.N.

— At Little Shelford, Cambridge, Richard Dill, esq., M.D., Brighton, to

MARRIAGES.

Augusta Caroline, daughter of the late Gen. Sir C. Wale, K.C.B.

8. At Russborough, Capt. Edmund Turton, 3rd Drag. Guards, to Lady Cecilia Leeson, daughter of the Earl of Milltown.

9. At Heydon, Norfolk, the Rev. Fitzgerald Gambier Jenyns, to Emily Rose Lytton, daughter of W. Earle Lytton Bulwer, esq.

— At Malta, Capt. Robert Boyle, R.A., to Frances Sydney, daughter of Francis F. Sankey, esq., M.D.

10. At Bradford, Hugh Edward Adair, esq., M.P., to Harriet Camilla, daughter of A. Adair, esq.

— At St. Michael's Church, Chester-square, the Rev. T. A. Walrond, late Incumbent of All Saints, Chardstock, to Anna Maria Louisa, daughter of the late Sir Thomas Troubridge, bart.

15. At St. George's, Hanover-square, John St. Aubyn, Esq., to the Lady Elizabeth Clementina Townshend, second daughter of the Marquis Townshend.

— At St. George's, Hanover-square, the Rev. Sir Hugh Henry Molesworth, bart., to Beatrice Anne, daughter of Charles Prideaux Brune, esq.

21. At Edinburgh, Major-Gen. Campbell, C.B., Madras Army, to Elizabeth, daughter of the late John Munro, esq.

22. At Hermanstadt, Transylvania, Sir Grenville Leofric Temple, bart., to Marie Aron Von Bistren, daughter of the late Minister of Finance for Transylvania.

— At Milford Church, Surrey, the Rev. Charles William Belgrave, Rector of North Kilworth, Leicestershire, to Annie, daughter of the late Vice-Adm. Dacres.

— At St. George's Church, Lieut.-Col. R. H. Howard Vyse, M.P., Royal Horse Guards (Blue), to Julia Agnes, daughter of Sir William Hilton Jolliffe, bart., M.P.

23. At Bray Church, Wicklow, St. John Legh Clowes, esq., of Torworth, Notts, to Hon. Elizabeth Caroline Bingham, daughter of the late Lord Clanmorris.

— At St. John's Church, Clapham, Charles Crawshay, esq., to Eliza Maria Jane, daughter of the late Benjamin Cubitt, esq.

24. At Bedhampton, Hants, James Alexander Gutterie, esq., to Ellinor, daughter of Rear-Adm. Sir James Stirling.

— At West Wickham, Kent, the Rev. James Cartmell, D.D., Master of Christ's College, Cambridge, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, to Frances Eliza, only child of the Rev. J. T. Austin.

25. At Rutnagherry, near Bombay,

William D'Oyly, esq., Bombay Civ. Serv., to Emma Susan, daughter of the Hon. and Rev. E. Pellew.

31. At Abbots Leigh, the Hon. and Rev. J. W. Lascelles, son of the Earl of Harewood, to Emma Clara, daughter of William Miles, esq., M.P., of Leigh Court, Somersetshire.

— At St. Marylebone Church, John Westropp, esq., of Attyflin Park, Limerick, to Charlotte Louisa, eldest daughter of Lady Whitehead, and of the late Lieut.-Gen. Sir Thomas Whitehead, K.C.B.

— At Childwall, near Liverpool, Henry Hugh Hornby, esq., to Sophia, daughter of Thomas Haigh, esq.

AUGUST.

2. At Poddington, Bedfordshire, the Rev. Edward Penrose Arnold, to Caroline Augusta, daughter of R. L. Orlebar, esq.

5. At Braelangwell, Ross-shire, Beauchamp Colclough Urquhart, 39th Regt. Bengal N.I., to Isabella Forbes Fraser, youngest daughter of the late Lieut.-Gen. Sir Hugh Fraser, K.C.B.

— At Newtownlimavady, Oliver Claude Pell, esq., to Adelaide, daughter of Marcus M'Causland, esq.

— At St. George's, Hanover-square, Francis Geary, esq., to Fanny Isabella, daughter of A. R. Prior, esq.

— At East Peckham Church, the Hon. James Byng, son of George sixth Visc. Torrington, to Caroline Louisa, daughter of William Cook, esq.

6. At Basildon Church, George Moffatt, esq., M.P., to Lucy, daughter of James Morrison, esq.

7. At Easton Neston, Lieut.-Col. Ogilvy, of the 2nd Life Guards, to Lady Henrietta Fermor, daughter of the late and sister of the present Earl of Pomfret.

9. At St. Marylebone, Major James W. S. Waller, K.H., and late of the 10th Foot, to Mary Georgina, daughter of the late Gen. Sir W. H. Pringle, G.C.B.

12. At St. Gabriel's, Pimlico, the Rev. Edward P. Eddrup, to Helen Annette, only daughter of Sir J. N. R. Campbell.

— At Mortlake, William Wynyard, esq., of the Bengal Civ. Serv., to Henrietta Ellen, daughter of Sir Henry Willock, K.L.S.

14. At Clifton Church, Sir William Sydney Thomas, bart., to Fanny Louisa, daughter of the late John Coulson, esq.

— At Castle Bellingham, Ireland, the Rev. William Thornhill, to Helen Jameson, daughter of the late John Woolsey, esq.

MARRIAGES.

14. At St. Weonard's, Capt. George Henry Warrington Carew, of Crowcombe Court, Somersetshire, to Mary Philippa, only daughter of Peter Rickards Mynors, esq.

19. At Emanuel Church, Camberwell, Thomas Smith Badger, esq., M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Reader on Real Property to the Inns of Court, to Rosalie, sister of Sir C. W. Champion de Crespigny, bart.

— At Datchet, Bouverie Alleyne, esq., to Charlotte Agnes Emma, daughter of Major-Gen. Sir W. Colebrooke, C.B., R.A.

— At Cockaye Hatley, Walter Scott Seton-Karr, esq., Bengal C.S., to Eleanor Katherine, daughter of the Hon. and Rev. R. C. Cust, Canon of Windsor, and Lady Anna Maria Cust.

20. At Sparsholt, near Winchester, Lieut.-Col. William West Turner, C.B., late of the Royal Fusiliers, to Bertha Violet, daughter of Stanley Lowe, esq.

— At Thoydon Garnon, Essex, William Robert Cusack Smith, esq., only son of the Right Hon. the Master of the Rolls for Ireland, to Mary Blanche, daughter of the late John Chisenhale Chisenhale, esq.

21. At Ryde, George Lawson Thomson, esq., M.D., to Harriet, daughter of the late Gen. Sir H. Worsley, G.C.B.

— At Chichester, George William Latham, esq., of Bradwell Hall, Cheshire, to Elizabeth Sarah, daughter of the Rev. H. W. R. Littman Johnson.

— At Hendon Church, Henry Alford Vaughan, esq., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford, to Adeline, daughter of J. Jackson, esq., M.D.

— At Holyrood Church, County Down, Randal Wilmer Hatfield, esq., of Thorparch Hall, Yorkshire, to Isabella Mary Anne Louisa; and Humphrey Brooke Firman, esq., of Gateforth-house, Yorkshire, to Anne Louisa, daughters of the late Thomas Gibbon Fitzgibbon, esq.

25. At the British Consulate, Dardanelles, William John Chads, Brevet-Major, 64th Regt., to Louisa Du Curroy, eldest daughter of the late C. A. Lander, esq.

26. At St. Saviour's Church, Jersey, Capt. the Hon. Helworth Liddell, 41st Regt., son of Lord Ravensworth, to Florence, daughter of W. H. Warrington, esq.

— At St. George's, Hanover-square, Percy Burrell, esq., eldest son of Sir Charles Merrik Burrell, bart., to Henrietta Katherine, daughter of Rear-Adm. Sir George and the Hon. Lady Brooke Pechell.

26. At St. George's, Hanover-square, John Leslie, esq., to Constance Whilhelmina Frances, youngest daughter of the late Col. the Right Hon. G. L. Dawson Damer.

— At Abbot's Ripton Church, Major the Hon. William Stuart Knox, M.P., 21st Fusiliers, son of the Earl of Ranfurly, to Georgiana, daughter of the late J. Boufroy Rooper, esq.

27. At Titchfield Church, Capt. Francis Powell Hopkins, 15th Foot, to Rachel Elizabeth, daughter of Lieut.-Gen. Bainbrigge, C.B.

28. At Montreal, Francis Drummond Fulford, esq., only son of the Bishop of Montreal, to Mary Ann, daughter of the late Philip Holland, esq.

— At Chacombe, the Rev. George Birch Reynardson, Rector of Eastling, Kent, to Vera, daughter of the late Francis Wykeham Martin, esq., of Leeds Castle, Kent.

— At St. Marylebone Church, Capt. Pattison, late 64th Regt., to Edith Ellen, daughter of the late Lieut.-Col. Lascelles.

— At Trinity Church, Dover, Welby Browne Jackson, esq., to Elizabeth Mary, daughter of T. J. Ireland, esq.

— At Clifton Church, Charles Henry Waring, esq., of the Darran Glamorganshire, to Lucy, daughter of the late Sir G. H. Freeling, bart.

SEPTEMBER.

2. At St. Stephen the Martyr, Regent's Park, Frederick Marrable, esq., to Madeline Francis Jane, daughter of James Cockburn, esq.

— At Charlton King's, Cheltenham, Claudius Buchanan Ker, of Cheltenham, M.D., to Isabella Elizabeth, youngest daughter of General Sir David Leighton, K.C.B.

3. At Swallowfield, Berks, Major D. C. Greene, 43rd Light Infantry, to Mary, daughter of the late Sir Henry Russell, bart.

4. In the Chapel of Merton College, Oxford, Sidney Owen, esq., Professor of History and Political Economy in the Elphinstone College, Bombay, to Mary Ellen, eldest daughter of Henry Sewell, esq., Colonial Secretary and First Minister of New Zealand.

— At Bangalore, Madras, Captain Fiennes Middleton Colville, 43rd Light Infantry, to Mary Grier, daughter of the late Major Noble.

MARRIAGES.

9. Thomas Young, esq., of Sackville-street, St. James's, to Katharine, daughter of Colonel Salwey.

— At St. George's, Hanover-square, Colonel Thomas M. Steele, C.B., Coldstream Guards, to Isabella Charlotte, only daughter of Edward Fitzgerald, esq.

— At St. Mary's Church, Lambeth, Captain George Goldsmith, R.N., C.B., Superintendent of Chatham Dockyard, to Mary Anne, daughter of the late Richard Rawes, esq.

— At Lanteglos by Fowey, Cornwall, Charles Twisden, esq., to Susan, daughter of the late Adm. James Carthew.

10. At St. John's-wood, Lucius H. Fitzgerald, esq., to Mary Katharine, daughter of the late Admiral the Hon. Sir John Talbot, G.C.B.

— At Dummer Church, Basingstoke, Charles Harris Blunt, esq., Bengal Art., to Mary Augusta, only daughter of the late Lieut.-Col. James Tod.

11. At Down Church, Kent, William P. Kodney, esq. to Diana Hotham, daughter of Sir J. W. Lubbock, bart.

— Commander Henry King, R.N., to Charlotte, daughter of the Rev. George Palmer.

12. At Paris, the Duke of Saldanha, Field-Marshal Commander-in-chief of the Portuguese Army, to Charlotte Binns, relict of E. Binns, esq.

16. At St. George's Church, Hanover-square, John George Johnston, esq., to Frances Grace, only daughter of Sir Theodore Henry Brinckman, bart.

— At St. Mary's, Bryanston-square, the Hon. and Very Rev. the Dean of Windsor, to the Hon. Magdalen Montagu, daughter of Lord Rokeby.

— At St. Peter's Church, Dublin, Major Algernon Robert Garrett, 46th Regt., to Elizabeth, third daughter of the late Col. King, K.H.

17. At St. George's, Hanover-square, Capt. Willes Johnson, R.N., Hennington Hall, Wilts, to Margaret Anne, daughter of David Pugh, esq., M.P.

— At St. Marylebone Church, the Hon. John S. Gaskin, President of her Majesty's Council in the Island of Barbados, to Mary, daughter of the late J. C. Eversley, esq., of the same island.

24. At the Church of All Saints, Upper Norwood, John Foster, esq., of the Inner Temple, barrister-at-law, to Eliza Ann, widow of Henry Colburn, esq.

— At St. Paul's Church, Edinburgh, the Rev. Thomas Huntley Greene, Rector of Marsh Gibbon, Bucks, to Helen Elizabeth,

daughter of the late Gen. the Hon. Sir Patrick Stuart, G.C.M.G.

24. At St. Mary's Church, Burley-in-Wharfedale, Yorkshire, Henry Bliss Crofton, esq., to Sophie, eldest daughter of Thomas Horsfall, esq.

25. At St. Peter's Church, Colombo, John Bailey, esq., Assistant Government Agent of Badulla, to Katherine Cecilia Elizabeth, daughter of his Excellency Sir H. G. Ward, K.G.C.M.G., Governor of the Island of Ceylon.

— At St Paul's, Knightsbridge, Lord Raglan, to Lady Georgiana Lygon, daughter of the Earl of Beauchamp.

— At Killough Castle, John Edward Venables Vernon, esq., of Clontarf Castle, Dublin, to the Hon. Rosa Gertrude Harriet Daly, daughter of the late Lord Dunsandle.

27. At Whitchurch, Harold Gill, esq., to Augustus Lucy, daughter of the late Rev. J. Phillipps Carpenter.

30. At St. George's, Hanover-square, Alexander R. Johnston, esq., to Frances Ellen, daughter of the late Richard Bury Palliser, esq.

OCTOBER.

1. At Simla, W. A. Ross, esq., Lieut. Bengal Horse Art., to Henrietta, eldest daughter of the late Maj.-Gen. Sir W. Sleeman, K.C.B.

2. In Bray Church, the Rev. Ferdinand Cotter Spiller, to the Hon. Anna Maria Bingham, daughter of the late Lord Clanmorris.

— At Topsham Church, Richard O. F. Steward, Major 41st Regt., to Olivia Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Henry Allen Johnson, bart.

3. At All Saints' Church, Southampton, William C. Anderson, esq., R.E., son of Col. Anderson, Royal Horse Art., to Wilhelmina Harriet, daughter of Major-Gen. H. W. Gordon, R.A.

7. At Malta, Lieut.-Col. John M. Adye, C.B., R.A., to Mary Cordelia, daughter of Rear-Admiral the Hon. Sir Montagu Stopford, K.C.B.

— At Widcombe Church, Bath, the Rev. G. E. Tate, to Ellen Georgiana, second daughter of the late Gen. Sir L. P. J. Parry.

— At St. George's, Hanover-square, Archibald Campbell Swinton, esq., of Kimmerghame, Berwick, to Georgiana Caroline, third daughter of the late Sir George Sitwell, bart.

MARRIAGES.

7. At East Cranmore, Capt. Douglas Labalmondiere, late of the 83rd Regt., Assistant-Commissioner of Metropolitan Police, to Margaret Doveton, daughter of John Moore Paget, esq.

— At St. Mary Magdalene, Oxford, Claudius R. W. F. Harris, esq., Lieut. 8th Madras Light Cavalry, to Alicia Maria, only daughter of the late Walter Augustus Shirley, D.D., Bishop of Sodor and Man.

8. In Charlotte-place, Edinburgh, J. B. Gardner, esq., Moulmein, to Ann, only surviving daughter of T. Howey, esq.

9. At Hallaton Church, John Edwards, esq., of Uppingham, to Julia Susanna, daughter of the late Sir Henry Bromley Hinrich.

— At St. John's Episcopal Chapel, Edinburgh, the Rev. J. Lander, Rector of Donnington, Herefordshire, to Isabella, fourth daughter of the late R. Cadell, esq.

— At the Church of the Holy Trinity, Hyde Park, George Francis Coventry Pocock, late Major 30th Regt., eldest son of Sir George Pocock, bart., to Honoria Harriet Alicia, daughter of the late Rev. E. H. Ravenhill.

— At St. James's Church, Westbourne-terrace, Alfred Mason, esq., to Elizabeth Haughton, daughter of the late Sir Simon Haughton Clarke, bart.

— At Kingston, Dorsetshire, the Rev. Eldon Surtees Bankes, Rector of Corfe Castle, to Cady Charlotte Elizabeth Scott, eldest daughter of the late Earl of Eldon.

10. At Edinburgh, James Dirom, esq., Capt. R.N., to Jane Catherine, only daughter of the late Alexander Pearson, esq.

14. At St. Anne's Church, Dublin, Robert Charles Thomas Pearse, esq., to Edith Frances Sheridan, daughter of R. S. Guinness, esq., M.P.

15. At Hamble, Capt. Charles Maxton Shakespear, E.I.C.S., to Maria Bell, daughter of Lieut.-Gen. Y. S. Fraser.

— At Peshawur, Sir William Hamilton, bart., of Preston, Lieut. Bengal Art., to Eliza Marcia, daughter of Major Barr, Horse Art.

— At the Catholic Church, Hindley, near Wigan, John Lawson, esq., eldest son of Sir William Lawson, bart., of Brough Hall, Yorkshire, to Mary Ann, daughter of Fredk. Gerard, esq.

— At the Cathedral, Bombay, George Strachan Mignon, esq., 15th N.I., to Jane Amelia Cawston, only daughter of the Rev. A. W. Cawston.

16. At Woodsetts, the Hon. Horace

Manners Moncton, Capt. 3rd Light Drags., brother of Viscount Galway, to Georgina, daughter of Sir Thomas Woollaston White, bart.

16. At the British Embassy, Paris, Walter Trevor Stannus, esq., to the Hon. Catharine Geraldine Vesey Fitzgerald, daughter of the Lord Fitzgerald and Vesey.

— At Llanover Church, Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson, F.R.S., D.C.L., to Caroline Catherine, daughter of Henry Lucas, esq.

— At Christ Church, Mussonrie, East Indies, Henry Archibald Mallock, esq., Bengal Art., to Mary Jane, second daughter of Sir William Brooke O'Shaughnessy.

21. At Florence, Tenby, Thomas Brook, esq., of Pencraig Court. and the Yew Tree, Herefordshire, to Helene Elizabeth, only daughter of the late John Leach, esq.

— At Wishaw, N.B., Capt. James Robertson Walker, R.N., of Gilgarran, Cumberland, to Katherine, daughter of the late J. Mackenzie, esq., Sheriff of the Lewis, Ross-shire.

23. At Harrow-on-the-Hill, Col. R. Percy Douglas, A.A.G. to the forces, eldest son of Gen. Sir Howard Douglas, bart., G.C.B., to Louisa, daughter of the late Robert Lang, esq.

— At Titchfield House, Kilmarnock, William Peock, esq., of Micleriggs, Paisley, to Mary Elizabeth, eldest daughter; and at the same time, George Crowley Ashby, esq., of Isleworth, Middlesex, to Janet Perry, second daughter of John Dickie, esq.

— At Leckhampton Church, Gloucestershire, Augustus Henry King, esq., Royal Art., Knight of the Legion of Honour, to Augusta Mary, daughter of Rear-Adm. T. W. Carter, C.B.

— At Poona, Lieut. Henry St. Clair Wilkins, son of the Ven. George Wilkins, D.D., Archdeacon of Nottingham, to Eliza Violet, only daughter of Major Colin McIntyre.

— At Stuttgart, Capt. Baron Henry de Hügel, to Adeline, daughter of Jules Benedict, esq., Manchester-square.

28. At Shrivenham, Alfred Sartoris, esq., to the Hon. Mary Barrington, daughter of Viscount and Viscountess Barrington.

30. At Cheltenham, M. F. Davidson, esq., of Singapore, to Maria Isabella, second daughter of the late Maj.-Gen. David Forbes, C.B.

— At the British Embassy, Berlin, George J. R. Hewett, esq., eldest son of Col. Sir George H. Hewett, bart., of Ne-

MARRIAGES.

therseale, Leicestershire, to Clara, youngest daughter of his Excellency the late Lieut.-Gen. Wilhelm von Pochhammer, &c.

30. Walter Carew Cocks, esq., to Isabella Susan, daughter of the Hon. Baron Alderson.

— At St. George's, Hanover-square, Sir Charles Robert Pigott, bart., of Knapton, to Mary Louisa, daughter of the late Capt. Hallowell Carew.

NOVEMBER.

5. At Abbott's Leigh, Major Bright, 19th Regt., to Catherine, daughter of William Miles, esq., M.P.

6. At St. George's, Hanover-square, Edward James Hawker, esq., to Margaret Jane, only daughter of George Rennie, esq., F.R.S.

— At Cheddon-Fitzpaine, Somerset, Lieut.-Col. Sir Archibald John Murray, bart., of Blackbarony, N.B., to Eliza Hope, only daughter of the late Samuel Unwin, esq.

— At Westbury, Wilts, the Rev. Henry Tndway, Rector of Walton-in-Gordano, Somerset, to Mary Leckonby, daughter of John Lewis Phipps, esq.

8. At St. Mary's Church, Bury St. Edmunds, Charles Wodelhouse, esq., to Maria, daughter of the late Matthew Potts, esq.

10. At St. George's Church, Denbighshire, Capt. the Hon. Walter Devereux, R.N., son of Viscount Hereford, to Adelaide Elinor, daughter of the late Hugh Robert Hughes, esq.

— At the British Embassy, Florence, Capt. John Montagu Burgoyne, Grenadier Guards, to Amy, only daughter of the late Capt. Henry Neelson Smith, R.E.

11. At St. George's, Hanover-square, Charles Fox Webster, esq., to Louisa, only daughter of Sir Henry Calder, bart.

12. At Shahjehanpore, Bengal Presidency, Lieut. Alexander Key, 28th B.N.I., to Mary E.I., daughter of the late Lieut.-Col. W. Rutherford.

— At Crayford, Kent, the Rev. Charles Edward Hadow, Assistant Chaplain H.E.I.C.S., Bengal Presidency, to Jane Mary, daughter of James McGregor, esq., M.P.

18. At Hambledon Church, Bucks, the Rev. Francis William Rice, Vicar of Fairfield, to Eliza Amelia, daughter of the late Rev. Henry Carnegie Knox.

— At St. James's Church, Piccadilly, Richard Thomas Glyn, esq., Capt. 24th Regt., to Anne Penelope, daughter of Col. Clements.

VOL. XCVIII.

18. At Kandy, Ceylon, Captain David Stewart, Ceylon Rifle Regt., to Isabella, daughter of Major-Gen. John Fraser.

20. At All Saints' Church, Knightsbridge, Lieut.-Col. Simmons, C.B., R.E., Major-Gen. in the Ottoman Army, to Blanch, only daughter of the late S. C. Western, esq.

— At St. Cuthbert's, Wells, the Rev. Edward H. Paget, M.A., to the Hon. Emma Mary Eden, daughter of Lord Auckland, Bishop of Bath and Wells.

25. At Christ Church, St. Pancras, the Rev. J. F. Halford, to Ismena, daughter of J. S. Andrews, esq.

— At St. James's Church, Piccadilly, Lieut.-Col. Montrésor, Grenadier Guards, of Denne Hill, Kent, to Laura, daughter of the Rev. W. W. Dickins.

26. At St. John's Church, Windsor, Capt. F. R. Pollock, 49th Bengal N.I., to Adriana, daughter of the late Sir Harris Nicolas, G.C.M.G.

— At St. Peter's, Eaton-square, Col. Frederick Paget, to Maria Georgina, eldest daughter of Charles Pascoe Grenfell, esq.

27. At Cuxton, Kent, the Rev. Harry Lancelot Wingfield, to Sophia Anna, daughter of the Rev. Robert William Shaw, M.A.

29. At Bassano, in Venetian Lombardy, John Ball, esq., M.P., Her Majesty's Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, to Eliza, daughter of the Count Parolini, of Bassano.

DECEMBER.

1. At St. Peter's Church, Dublin, Sir John Marcus Stewart, bart., of Ballygawley House, Tyrone, to Annie Coote, eldest daughter and co-heiress of George Powell Houghton, esq., of Kilmarnock.

2. At St. Alphage's, Greenwich, the Ven. Archdeacon Robinson, D.D., Master of the Temple, to Mary, daughter of Lieut. Bedford, R.N.

— At St. John's, Notting Hill, Thomas Learmonth, jun., esq., to Louisa Martha Burer, daughter of the late Major-Gen. Sir Thomas Valiant, K.C.B. and K.H.

— At Wraxall, Somerset, George Edward Adams, esq., to Mary Dorothea, daughter of the late George Henry Gibbs, esq.

3. At Holmwood Church, near Dorking, William Alexander Ellerman, esq. K.H., and his Hanoverian Majesty's Consul at Antwerp, to Louisa, daughter of Baron de Hocheplé Larpent.

Q

6. At St. John's, Paddington, Charles Paget Fitzhardinge Berkeley, esq., to Louisa Elizabeth, only daughter of the late Henry Lindow Lindow, esq.

9. At March Baldon, the Rev. Henry Leighton Fanshawe, to Ellen, daughter of Guy Thomson, esq.

11. At St. Peter's, Walthamstow, W. Raymond Ximenes, esq., 8th (the King's) Regt., to Alice, only daughter of James Helme, esq.

— At the Church of St. Columba, Argyleshire, the Hon. Egremont William Lascelles, son of the Earl of Harewood, to Jesse Elizabeth, daughter of Neill Malcolm, esq., of Poltalloch.

— At Trinity Church, Marylebone, William Henry Frederick Sykes, esq., of the 3rd Bombay Cav., to Julia Elizabeth, youngest daughter of Charles Walter, esq.

16. At St. Saviour's Church, Upper Chelsea, Colonel Fredk. Holt Robe, C.B., to Louisa Georgiana, daughter of the late John Matthie, esq.

18. At St. Mary Abbott's, Kensington, H. T. Erskine, esq., to Eliza Sarah, only daughter of the late Comm. H. W. Hore, esq.

23. At St. Mary's Church, Bryanston-square, Henry Orlando Bridgeman, esq., to Sophia Caroline, daughter of Lieut.-Col. Close.

— At the British Consulate, Madeira, David Holland Erskine, esq., late Capt. 92nd Highlanders, to Augusta Jane, third daughter of George Stoddart, esq.

30. At St. John's, Notting Hill, the Rev. Thomas Edward Morris, M.A., Vicar of Carlton-in-Craven, to Amelia Jane, daughter of Henry Pownall, esq.

— Captain Nisbet, 1st Dragoon Guards, to Rosabelle Frances, daughter of the late John Bishop, esq.

— At Dover, Robert Edward Wellington Garnham, esq., to Jesse Marian, daughter of the Rev. A. T. Nash.

— At Middleton, Edward Stanley, Heywood, esq., to Louisa, daughter of John Peel, esq.

31. At St. Peter's Port, Guernsey, Major R. Carey, 40th Regt., to Caroline, daughter of John Le Marchant, esq.

In December, at Madras, Gavin Ainslie Turnbull, esq., 12th Royal Lancers, to Mary Isabella, daughter of J. P. M. Myers, esq.

DEATHS.

1855.

AUGUST.

23. In Lansdown Crescent, Bath, in his 82nd year, Henry Lawson, esq., Fellow of the Royal and Astronomical Societies. Mr. Lawson, who was the younger son of the Very Rev. Johnson Lawson, Dean of Battle, and his brother were apprenticed to an eminent optician in Cornhill; but having been left a competent fortune, Henry did not engage in business, but devoted himself to scientific pursuits, and especially to astronomy, of which his early education had given him considerable knowledge. He was elected a Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society in 1833, and of the Royal Society in 1840. In 1841 he removed to No. 7, Lansdown Crescent, Bath, where he formed an observatory, which he fitted up with excellent instruments. He frequently published scientific papers, the result of his observations. When age came on, and prevented his further pursuit of astronomical science, Mr. Lawson proposed to present his valuable instruments for the formation of an observatory at Nottingham. This generous design, owing to some unfortunate disputes, fell to the ground. Some of these choice instruments Mr. Lawson presented to public establishments, and his meteorological instruments and books he has left to Mr. Lowe, who has an observatory at Beeston, Notts. He has also bequeathed sums of money to various scientific and charitable societies.

1856.

JANUARY.

1. At his residence, Queen's Gardens, Hyde Park, aged 61, George Gisborne Babington, esq., F.R.S., formerly one of the Surgeons to St. George's Hospital.

2. At Limerick, Margaret-Leith, wife of Lieut.-Col. Muller, daughter of Edward Leigh Pemberton, esq.

— At his residence in London, aged 78, Andrewe Ure, M.D., F.R.S., &c., &c. Dr. Ure was one of the veterans of chemical science, a contemporary of Davy and Wollaston, of Gay Lussac and Berzelius. His name is associated with some original and

DEATHS.—JAN.

remarkable researches, but he will be chiefly distinguished in the annals of science by his success in the application of chemistry to the arts and to manufactures.

Dr. Ure was born at Glasgow, May 18, 1778. He studied at the university of his native town, and afterwards at that of Edinburgh. In 1804 he was appointed Professor of Chemistry at the Andersonian University, which had recently been established under the presidency of Dr. Birkbeck. In 1809, when the Glasgow Observatory was about to be established, Dr. Ure came to London, commissioned to make the scientific arrangements. For many years after, the life of Dr. Ure was a series of diligent study, unwearied research, and valuable discoveries, all of which were communicated to the world in a series of papers, which attracted great attention; and most of the discoveries being of a practical tendency, and available for the arts and manufactures, Dr. Ure's fame rose to a great height. In 1821 the "Dictionary of Chemistry" was first published, of which many editions have since appeared. In 1830 Dr. Ure came to reside in London, and was appointed in 1834 chemist to the Board of Customs. The important researches on sugar refining, which he conducted for the Government, led to the fixation of the then established duties. In 1835 he published "The Philosophy of Manufactures;" and in 1836, a work on "The Cotton Manufactures of Great Britain compared with that of other Countries."

The "Dictionary of Arts, Manufactures, and Mines" was first published in 1837, with a supplement two years later; the whole having been repeatedly revised, to include the most recent discoveries and inventions, and greatly enlarged in the latest edition of 1853. This is a book of vast research, and the variety of subjects embraced in it may be estimated from the fact, that on the French translation it was thought advisable to employ nineteen *collaborateurs*, all regarded as adepts on their special subjects. Dr. Ure thus honourably occupied a position in scientific work analogous to the literary feat of Dr. Johnson, who single-handed produced the English Dictionary, the counterpart of which was the fruit of the united labours of the French Academy.

During his residence in London, Dr. Ure's practical occupation in chemistry has chiefly been the conduct of analyses for the Government, or on consultation for commercial purposes. His skill and accuracy as an analytic chemist were well known,

and it has been stated on good authority that none of his results have ever been impugned. From the beginning of his career he was noted as an experimental operator.

Dr. Ure was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1822. He was one of the original Fellows of the Geological Society, and was a member of several scientific bodies in this country and abroad.

3. At Coul, co. Ross, aged 51, Sir Alexander Mackenzie, the eighth Baronet of that place (1673), a Deputy Lieutenant of Ross-shire, the eldest son of Sir George Steuart Mackenzie, Vice-President of the Royal Society of Edinburgh. He entered the service of the East India Company in 1824, on the Bengal establishment, and was present at the siege and capture of Bhurtpore in 1825-6, and received the medal. He served as Deputy Judge Advocate-general with the army of Gwalior, and had a horse killed under him at the battle of Maharajpore, Dec. 29, 1843. He took part also in the first campaign on the Sutlej, 1845-6, but was not engaged in any of the battles. He was appointed Fort-Adjutant at Chunar in 1847, and retired from the Bengal Army Aug. 1, 1851. He succeeded to the baronetcy upon the death of his father in 1848.

— George Buchan, esq., of Kelloe, co. Berwick. Mr. Buchan was the son and heir of George Buchan, esq., of Kelloe, by Anne, fourth daughter of the Right. Hon. Robert Dundas, of Arniston, President of the Court of Session, and sister to the late Lord Chief Baron Dundas. For several years Mr. Buchan held the office of Chief Secretary at Madras—an eminent post, in which he greatly distinguished himself.

— At his seat, Picton Castle, Pembrokeshire, after a short illness, aged 56, the Right Hon. Richard Bulkeley Philipps-Philipps, Baron Milford, of Picton Castle, in the county of Pembroke, a Baronet, and Lord Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of the county of the town of Haverford-west. Lord Milford was the only son of John Grant, esq., of Nolton, near Haverford-west, by his wife, Mary Philippa Artemisia, who was the only daughter and heiress of James Child, esq., of Bigelly House, Pembrokeshire, and the sole grandchild of Bulkeley Philipps, esq., of Abercoves, Caermarthenshire. His lordship was born the 7th June, 1801, and in 1824 assumed, by sign-manual, in respect of the memory of his maternal cousin, Sir Richard Philipps, Baron Milford (a barony of a former creation then extinct), whose estates

he inherited, the surname and arms of Philipps. He was for a long time a prominent member of the House of Commons, having represented Haverford-west in Parliament for nearly twenty years. He was created a baronet the 13th February, 1828, and was raised to the peerage in 1847. His lordship was twice married, but having no issue by either marriage, his peerage and baronetcy become extinct.

3. At Constantinople, a certain mussahib (Imperial Buffoon), named Said Effendi, at the age of 121 years and 7 months. He had served four Sultans as jester, and, notwithstanding his advanced age, was often called by the present Sovereign, to say witty things and to perform antics.

4. At Litlington, Cambridgeshire, in his 81st year, the Rev. William Webb, D.D., Master of Clare Hall, Cambridge, Vicar of Litlington, and F.L.S. Dr. Webb, was the son of Mr. William Webb, M.A., master of Bishop Vesey's grammar-school at Sutton Coldfield, and a magistrate for the county of Warwick. He was entered at Clare Hall in 1793. He had been elected a Fellow of Clare Hall, and had officiated as College Tutor for several years, when the valuable living of Fornham All Saints, near Bury St. Edmund's, became vacant. To this living he was presented by the college, 10th July, 1815; but before his year of grace had expired he was induced to resign his living and return to Cambridge, on being unanimously elected Master of Clare Hall. He was allowed to hold with his Mastership the living of Litlington, where he expired, after holding the Mastership forty-one years, during which time he was twice Vice-Chancellor.

— At Tottenham Park, near Marlborough, Wiltshire, in his 83rd year, the Most Hon. Charles Brudenell-Bruce, Marquess of Ailesbury, Earl Bruce of Whorlton, county York, and Viscount Savernake, of Savernake Forest, county Wilts (1821), second Earl of Ailesbury, of the second creation in his family (1776), and third Baron Bruce of Tottenham, county Wilts (1746-7), K.T. The Marquess was the third but only surviving son of Thomas Lord Bruce, afterwards created Earl of Ailesbury, by Susannah, daughter of Henry Hoare, esq., of Stourhead.

He entered the House of Commons as member for Marlborough at the general election of 1796, and continued to represent that borough until he succeeded to the peerage on the death of his father, April 19, 1814. At the coronation of George IV. he was raised to the rank of a

Marquess by patent dated July 17, 1821, and he was elected a Knight of the Thistle in 1819. The Marquess was formerly Colonel of the Wiltshire Yeomanry, and afterwards Colonel-Commandant of the Wiltshire Militia.

The Marquess of Ailesbury was twice married: first, at Florence, in 1793, to the Hon. Henrietta Maria Hill, eldest daughter of Noel, first Lord Berwick, who died in 1831; and secondly in 1833, Maria-Elizabeth, youngest daughter of the late Hon. Charles Tollemache, third son of Louisa, Countess of Dysart. His lordship had issue by both.

4. At Cheam House, Surrey, the residence of her son-in-law, George Wilde, esq., Hester, widow of Richard Curteis Croughton, esq., of Tenterden, daughter of the late Thomas Peel, esq., of Trenant Park, Cornwall.

5. Aged 81, Henry-Anne, relict of Col. John Dick Burnaby, of Evington, Leic.

— At Pockeridge House, Wilts, John Edridge, esq., formerly a councillor and alderman of Bath.

— At the episcopal palace, St. Finn Barr's, Cork, the Right Rev. James Wilson, D.D., Lord Bishop of Cork, Cloyne, and Ross, aged 76. The Right Rev. Prelate was a native of Dublin, and was educated at Trinity College. After performing for some years parochial duties at St. Andrew's, about the year 1828, he was appointed Chancellor of Leighlin, and subsequently to the rectory of Killinane, in the same diocese. He was a firm supporter of the national system of education, and for several years had filled the office of secretary to the National Board. He was then appointed Precentor of St. Patrick's, and for many years acted as examining chaplain of the Archbishop of Dublin. He was raised to the see of Cork in 1848. The deceased prelate was popularly esteemed as a learned and pious divine, distinguished for his experience in ecclesiastical affairs, and for a conciliatory and cordial spirit towards those who differed from him in faith. He was, in consequence, regarded with much favour by the Roman Catholics.

— At a very advanced age, the Rev. Charles Eustace, of Robertstown, county Kildare. This gentleman was the representative and heir of the Viscounts Balinglass, which dignity in the peerage of Ireland was created by King Henry VIII. in 1543. In 1839 he petitioned the Crown that his right to that dignity might be acknowledged, and the Irish attorney-general,

having investigated the case, reported that "the petitioner had shown sufficient evidence of his right to the dignity of Viscount Baltinglass, in case the attainder of James, third Viscount, temp. Elizabeth, were reversed."

6. At Avisford, near Arundel, aged 72, Lady Elizabeth Louisa Reynell, widow of Lieut-Gen. Sir Thos. Reynell, Bart., K.C.B., fourth daughter of George, first Marquess of Waterford. She was married first in 1816, to Major-Gen. Sir Denis Park, K.C.B., &c., who died in 1823; and secondly in 1831, to Lieut-Gen. Sir Thomas Reynell, Bart., K.C.B., who died in 1848.

7. At Taverham Hall, Norfolk, aged 71, Nathaniel Micklethwait, esq., a magistrate for that county, and sheriff of Norfolk in 1810.

— Suddenly, Joseph Brotherton, esq., the excellent and universally respected M.P. for Salford for nearly a quarter of a century. Mr. Brotherton was a successful cotton and silk manufacturer, from which business, after making an independence, he retired some years ago. Mr. Brotherton was first returned to Parliament for the borough of Salford, as its first member, in 1832. In the House he showed himself ever a consistent and firm advocate of Liberal opinions; all progressive measures, and especially all of a benevolent or educational character, had his earnest and staunch support. He carried his love of reform even to amending the mode of carrying on business in Parliament. Every one knows how strenuous were his efforts to shorten the sittings of the Commons after midnight. In his attendance upon his parliamentary duties Mr. Brotherton was most assiduous. Rarely was the Speaker in the chair and Mr. Brotherton absent; and it was not an unfrequent occurrence for the Speaker to call upon the hon. member to move the adjournment of the House, when the Secretary to the Treasury had retired. Mr. Brotherton was Chairman of the Private Bills Committee. He took so lively an interest in the business arrangements of the House of Commons, that it was his invariable custom, at the close of each session, to move for a series of returns showing the progress of public and private business; the number and duration of sittings, and the number of divisions. Though representing a manufacturing constituency, he was a warm advocate, with Lord Ashley (now Earl of Shaftesbury), and the late Mr. Fielden, of the 'Ten Hours' Bill, and was accustomed to deduce arguments in its fa-

vour from his own career. Mr. Brotherton was, in his way of living, a strict vegetarian and abstainer from all spirituous liquors, and was an active supporter of those principles. In private as in public life, he was a most worthy and amiable man, and was much esteemed and beloved by all who knew him. Mr. Brotherton, to the general regret of his friends and the public, died suddenly, whilst travelling in an omnibus from his residence, Rosehill, Pendleton, into Manchester.

7. At Sileby, Leicestershire, within a few days of the patriarchal age of 94, the Rev. John Dudley, M.A., vicar of the parish and of Humberstone. This venerable divine, who was second wrangler and mathematical prizeman in 1785, was the son of one and grandson of another Vicar of Humberstone; himself held it for sixty-two years. The incumbency of the three generations extended over 142 years.

8. At his residence near Irvine, in Ayrshire, in his 69th year, John Ferguson, esq., of Cairnbrook. Mr. Ferguson had realized in trade and inherited a vast fortune, but always lived in an inexpensive and unostentatious manner, though no miser. It was found that his fortune amounted to no less than 1,250,000*l.*; which he appears to have distributed in a judicious manner. Relations who were poor he has made comfortable, and those who were already in easy circumstances are now affluent. He has left legacies to relations to the amount of 681,000*l.* The legatees amount to upwards of one hundred in number, and the legacies vary from 500*l.* to 50,000*l.* to the respective recipients. He has also left 20,000*l.* among twenty four personal friends; but the bequest in which the public are most interested are those for charitable, educational, and religious purposes. For the benefit of the town of Irvine, in various modes, about 13,000*l.*; for charitable, educational, and benevolent societies and institutions in Scotland, 50,000*l.*; for religious societies and institutions in Scotland, 20,000*l.*; for ragged or industrial schools in Scotland, 10,000*l.*; or, in the option of Mr. Fergusson's trustees, the annual income of these sums to be applied for these purposes. The reversion of his estate he has directed to be set apart, and invested on real or personal securities as a permanent fund, to be called "The Ferguson Bequest Fund," the interest or produce thereof to be paid and applied towards the maintenance and promotion of religious ordinances and educa-

tion and missionary operations, and for public libraries, in the first instance, in the six western counties of Scotland—viz. county of Ayr, stewartry of Kirkcudbright, and counties of Wigtown, Lanark, Renfrew, and Dumbarton, by payment for the erection or support of churches and schools in connection with the *quoad sacra* churches of the Establishment, Free Church, the United Presbyterian Church, the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and the Independent Church.

S. At Torquay, aged 39, Margaret-Matilda, eldest daughter of the late Sir Albert Pell, one of Her Majesty's Justices of the Court of Review.

— At his residence, Citadel Road, Plymouth, aged 73, Robert Henry Rogers, retired Rear-Admiral, third son of the late Sir Frederick Leman Rogers, Bart., M.P. for, and Recorder of, Plymouth. Admiral Rogers saw a great deal of active service during the war, and served in the expedition against New Orleans, where he fought on shore in the breaching-batteries, and in command of a body of seamen, and was particularly noticed for his exertions by Sir Edward Thomas Troubridge.

9. At Burlingham Hall, Norfolk, aged 35, Lieutenant Henry Negus Burroughes, R.N., eldest surviving son of Henry Negus Burroughes, esq., M.P., by Jane, sister to the gallant Sir Wm. Hoste, bart., Capt. R.N.

10. At his seat, Stourhead, Wilts, aged 69, Sir Richard Hoare, Bart. He was eldest son of the late Sir Henry Hugh Hoare, and nephew of Sir Richard Colt Hoare, F.R.S. and F.S.A. the celebrated antiquary, and author of the "History of Ancient and Modern Wiltshire."

— At Clevedon, aged 75, Mrs. Anne Lempriere Collingwood, relict of the Rev. John Lempriere, D.D.

— In Nottingham Place, Major Stones, late of the 13th Light Dragoons.

— In Montagu Place, Francis Ann, widow of Lient.-Gen. Sir Francis Wilder, of the Manor House, Binfield, Berks.

— In Hyde Park Street, after a short but severe illness, in his 70th year, John Adams, esq., Sergeant-at-Law, and Assistant Judge of the Middlesex Sessions.

11. At Newton Hall, near Felton, Samuel Edward Widdrington, esq., Commander, R.N., K.T.S., a magistrate and deputy-lieutenant of Northumberland, F.R.S. and F.G.S. He was the eldest son of the Rev. Joseph Cook, M.A., of Newton, by Sarah Brown, grand-niece and coheir to Nathaniel Widdrington, esq., the last of the

male line of the ancient family of Widdrington, of Hauxley, co. of Northumberland. He entered the Navy in 1809, and saw some service before the close of the war. He was first lieutenant of the *Windsor Castle*, 74, Capt. Charles Dashwood, which ship was at Lisbon during a popular commotion, when Don John of Portugal took refuge on board of her. Mr. Cook was in consequence presented with the order of the Tower and Sword, and at the earnest request of his Royal Highness he was promoted to the rank of commander on the 3rd of June, 1824; but was not further employed. In 1840 he took the name of Widdrington; as did the other coheir of that family, Colonel Tinling, afterwards General Sir David Latimer Tinling Widdrington, K.C.H. Subsequently, by purchase, Commander Widdrington became possessed of the whole Widdrington estate, and served the office of High Sheriff of Northumberland in 1854. He was the author of some approved travels in Spain. He married, in 1832, Dorothy, second daughter of the late Alexander Davison, esq., of Swarland Park, Northumberland; but leaving no issue, he is succeeded in his estates by his nephew, Shalcross Fitzherbert Jacson, esq.

11. At Beattie's Hotel, Dover Street, aged 80, Phillippa, relict of Capt. Richard Budd Vincent, C.B., R.N.

12. At Betchworth House, near Dorking, after a very short illness, in his 72nd year, the Right Hon. Hen. Goulburn, M.P., for the University of Cambridge, a Deputy-Lieutenant of Surrey, M.A. and D.C.L.

Mr. Goulburn was the eldest son of the late Munbee Goulburn, esq., of Portland Place, and the Hon. Susan Chetwynd, daughter of William, fourth Viscount Chetwynd. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1807, he was elected M.P. for the borough of Horsham. He was made Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department in Feb., 1810, under the Duke of Portland's ministry, and held the office during the administration of his Grace's successor, the unfortunate Mr. Spencer Perceval. At the general election in 1812, he was elected for St. German's. In August, 1812, he was appointed by Lord Liverpool Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies—an office which he held up to 1821. In 1818 and 1820 he was returned to the House of Commons for West Looe, and sat for Armagh from 1826 to 1831.

Mr. Goulburn accepted the post of Chief

DEATHS.—JAN.

Secretary for Ireland in December, 1821, and was then made a Privy Councillor. He filled that office under the several administrations of the Earl of Liverpool, Viscount Goderich, Mr. Canning, and the Duke of Wellington; when, in March, 1828, the illustrious Duke selected him to fill the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, and he thus became a member of the Cabinet. He continued at the head of the financial department of the State, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, until the Duke of Wellington retired, in January, 1830, to make way for Earl Grey.

At the general election in 1826, Sir John Copley, the present Lord Lyndhurst, and Mr. Goulburn became candidates for the University of Cambridge, in opposition to the former members, Lord Palmerston and Mr. Bankes. The result was in favour of Sir John Copley and Lord Palmerston.

In 1831, the members of the University were discontented with the Earl of Burlington (then Mr. Cavendish) and Viscount Palmerston, on account of their advocacy of the Reform Bill. Mr. Goulburn and the Right Hon. William Yates Peel were started in opposition, and after a severe contest unseated the former members. Since that time Mr. Goulburn continued to represent that University in Parliament, though not always without opposition.

On the formation of Sir Robert Peel's short administration in December, 1834, Mr. Goulburn was appointed Secretary of State for the Home Department.

In 1839, he was proposed for the office of Speaker of the House of Commons, supported by the Conservative party; but Mr. Shaw Lefevre, the present Speaker, supported by the Whig and Liberal party, succeeded, there being for Mr. Goulburn 299 votes, against 317 for Mr. Lefevre. When Sir Robert Peel was again called upon, in September, 1841, to take office, he selected Mr. Goulburn for his Chancellor of the Exchequer. In this office he most ably seconded his great chief in the social and commercial reforms which have rendered immortal the later years of that statesman's life. How much was due to the influence of that presiding genius, and how much to Mr. Goulburn's own talents, cannot be known; but assuredly Mr. Goulburn was one of the most successful Chancellors of the Exchequer ever known. He did not, like many of his former colleagues in office, join the Earl of Aberdeen's Government, although he invariably gave the Ministry his independent support, and was among

the minority in the division on Mr. Roebuck's motion in January last year, which had the effect of ousting the Earl of Aberdeen's ministry. He enjoyed the annual pension of 2000*l*.

After his retirement with the late Sir Robert Peel, in 1846, Mr. Goulburn took no very active part in politics, but always supported those measures he deemed necessary to fully carry out the views of his distinguished friend on the policy of free-trade. In 1850, he was appointed one of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners (with a salary of 1000*l*.) He was created D.C.L. by the University of Oxford in 1834. The late Sir Robert Peel appointed him one of his executors (Viscount Hardinge being the other) and guardian to his children until they attained their majority.

Mr. Goulburn married, December 21, 1811, the Hon. Jane Montagu, third daughter of Matthew, fourth Lord Rokeby; and by that lady, who survives him, had issue.

12. At the Grove, Watford, aged 80, the Hon. Mrs. Villiers, mother of the Earl of Clarendon. She was daughter of John, first Lord Boringdon, by his second wife, the Hon. Theresa Robinson, second daughter of Thomas, first Lord Grantham, and aunt to Earl de Grey. She was married in 1798 to the Hon. George Villiers, and left his widow in 1827; having had issue ten children.

14. Aged 70, Richard Janion Nevill, esq., of Llangennech, Carmarthenshire; Sheriff of Carmarthenshire in 1836.

15. Aged 42, Maynard, wife of Rear-Adm. Eliot, fourth daughter of the late George Baring, esq.

— In Hartford Street, Mayfair, aged 86, the Right Hon. Charlotte Maria, dowager Countess of Stradbroke, daughter of Abraham Whittaker, esq., of Lyston House, Herefordshire.

16. At the Rev. W. Willam's, Leeds, aged 81, the Rev. Jonathan Crowther, Classical Tutor of the Wesleyan Theological Institution, Didsbury; editor of the "London Quarterly Review," and long known as one of the most eminent ministers in the Wesleyan Church.

— Aged 55, George Waugh, esq., an eminent solicitor, of Great James Street, Bedford Row, and Ladbroke Square. He was shot in the street by a person named Weston, formerly a client. [See CHRONICLE, p. 9.]

16. At Edinburgh, aged 55, the Right Hon. Elizabeth, Countess Dowager of

DEATHS.—JAN.

Erroll, third daughter of the late King William IV., and married December 4, 1820, William George, 17th Earl of Erroll, who died in April, 1846. Her ladyship leaves issue.

17. At Devonport, aged 65, Harriet, wife of Vice-Adm. Manley H. Dixon.

— In Clifford Street, aged 78, Clara, wife of Augustus Elliott Fuller, esq., M.P., of Rose Hill, Sussex, eldest daughter and coheir of the late Owen Putland Meyrick, esq., of Bodorgan, Anglesea.

— In Dublin, Peter la Touche, esq., of Bellevue, county Wicklow.

— At Bath, Mary, widow of John Wingfield Shaw, esq., daughter of the late Sir Christopher Baynes, bart.

— At Hastings, in his 40th year, Thomas Attwood Walmisley, esq., Mus. D., Professor of Music in the University of Cambridge. He was the eldest son of Thomas F. Walmisley, esq., of Cowley Street, Westminster. He was admitted a member of Trinity College, Cambridge, and took the degree of Bachelor of Music in 1833. On the death of Dr. Clarke Whitfield in 1836, he was elected Professor of Music. His music for the Ode on the installation of Prince Albert as Chancellor of the University was much admired. He published a collection of chants and several other compositions.

— In Crawley Street, Oakley Square, Mr. Joseph Haydn, late of Carey Street, Lincoln's Inn.

Mr. Haydn was the compiler of—The Dictionary of Dates and Universal Reference, relating to all Ages and Nations, 8vo. 1841. This work has passed through eight editions. The Book of Dignities, containing Rolls of the Official Personages of the British Empire, Civil, Ecclesiastical, Judicial, Military, Naval, and Municipal; together with the Sovereigns of Europe, the Peerage of England and of Great Britain, &c. 1851. 8vo. Mr. Haydn also edited the last impression of Lewis's Topographical Dictionaries. Mr. Haydn had been afflicted with severe illness for many months. Very shortly before his death a pension of 25*l.* was assigned to him, from Her Majesty's privy purse. His widow receives a somewhat larger annuity from the same source.

— At Hartpury, Gloucestershire, aged 75, the Rev. Charles Crawley, Vicar of that parish, an hon. Canon of Gloucester, Rural Dean in the Forest of Dean, a deputy-lieutenant, and for forty-six years a magistrate of the county.

18. At Belfast, in his 48th year, William Rowlatt, esq., Commander, R.N. Commander Rowlatt was the son of the Rev. William Henry Rowlatt, many years Reader of the Temple Church.

— At Morton Cottage, Portobello, aged 59, the Hon. James Sinclair, a Deputy-Lieutenant of the counties of Cromarty and Caithness, and Lieut.-Colonel of the Ross, Caithness, Sutherland, and Cromarty Militia; uncle to the Earl of Caithness.

19. At Bristol, Charles Gray Harford, esq., second surviving son of the late John S. Harford, esq., of Blaise Castle.

— At Southsea, aged 63, Henrietta, widow of Sir John Newbolt, Chief Justice of Madras.

— At Bonn, on the Rhine, aged 17, William, eldest son of the Right Hon. Edward Strutt, M.P.

— At St. John's Lodge, Cambridge, aged 78, Ralph Tatham, D.D., Master of St. John's College; son of the Rev. Ralph Tatham, Vicar of Bishopston, Durham.

20. At Belvoir Castle, Grantham, aged 79, the most noble John Henry Manners, fifth Duke and fourteenth Earl of Rutland, senior Knight of the Garter, Lord-Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of the county of Leicester, and Colonel of the Leicestershire Militia, High Steward of Cambridge, Recorder of Scarborough and Grantham, a trustee of the British Museum, one of the Council of King's College, London, D.C.L., &c.

He was born on the 4th of January, 1778, and was the eldest son of Charles, fourth Duke, who died suddenly in 1787, at the age of 34, from an internal attack, while Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, by the Lady Mary Isabella Somerset, youngest daughter of Charles, fourth Duke of Beaufort, who died in 1831, and who had the reputation of being the most beautiful woman of her day.

The late Duke succeeded to the title and princely estates of his father when he was under ten years, and was placed under the guardianship of Mr. Pitt and the Duke of Beaufort, and was educated at Eton under the care of Dr. Sparke, afterwards Bishop of Ely, and at the usual age entered Trinity College, Cambridge, then under Dr. Postlethwaite, where he took the degree of M.A. in 1797.

During his Grace's long minority, his vast possessions were most carefully and judiciously managed, and consequently when, in January, 1799, his Grace attained his majority, he came into possession of a mag-

DEATHS.—JAN.

nificent patrimony—not much less than £100,000 a year in landed estates, besides a large sum in cash, the accumulations of his minority. His Grace was also the patron of more than forty Church livings. In a very short period he became a Knight of the Garter, Lord-Lieutenant of the county of Leicester, and Recorder of Grantham, Cambridge, and Scarborough. With these and other sources of patronage and power added to his vast possessions, John Henry, Duke of Rutland, yielded to few of his peers in local or parliamentary influence. Immediately on coming of age, his Grace married the Lady Elizabeth Howard, fifth daughter of Frederick, Earl of Carlisle, with whom he lived in uninterrupted happiness until her Grace's death in 1825. In 1801 was commenced the rebuilding of Belvoir Castle, in the room of the old castle, which had been reconstructed shortly after the civil wars, but was a plain, unpretending structure, and was planned more with a view to security than architectural ornament. This task, which will ever be an enduring monument to his Grace's memory, occupied himself and his Duchess for several years. At the same time, the hills around Belvoir were adorned with plantations, and drives and walks laid out through the domain. These, and the embellishment of the surrounding villages, were in a great measure planned by the Duchess of Rutland, whose views in everything which related to improvement were grand and magnificent, and who brought to the task not only an enlarged capacity, but a refined taste, and almost the skill of a professional artist.

In 1803, when this country was threatened with invasion, his Grace raised his tenantry, and enrolled more than 1000 men, and took a most active share in maintaining them efficiently.

For many years after this, the Duke, whilst superintending the building of his castle, and bringing up his numerous family, was a distinguished master of hounds, and the Belvoir hunt became as celebrated as any in the kingdom. His Grace was likewise the frank and hospitable entertainer of a distinguished circle of friends and acquaintance, comprising many men of mark, fashion, and wit. For a considerable period of his life his Grace was also a patron of the turf, and kept a racing-stud at Newmarket, where the Palace was placed at his disposal after Cheveley became dilapidated. His Grace was not very

successful on the turf; but after several years he bore off what the lamented Lord George Bentinck termed "The blue ribbon of the Turf," by winning the Derby with his horse "Cadland."

In 1814 the Duke was honoured with a royal visit, having entertained the Prince Regent at Belvoir for several days on the occasion of the christening of his Grace's eldest son, the (then) Marquis of Granby. The next event in order of time was of a calamitous nature. In October, 1816, an awful and destructive fire broke out during the night, by which the north-west and north-east fronts of the castle were totally destroyed, along with half of the valuable paintings and a portion of the plate. By this event, lovers of British art have to regret the loss of "The Nativity," by Sir Joshua Reynolds, then valued at 3000 guineas, besides other gems of art. His Grace bore this calamity with great equanimity and resignation, and lost no time in commencing the rebuilding of the destroyed portions. But in 1825 he had to undergo a more trying calamity, in the death of his Duchess, after a very short illness;—the talents and accomplishments of this distinguished lady have been before adverted to. His Grace keenly felt the loss of a companion who, after more than twenty-six years of wedded happiness, had been snatched from him in the prime of life, and in the possession of a mind whose comprehensive faculties were daily more and more developing themselves.

The Duke and Duchess were both of a highly literary turn of mind, and several publications evince their talents and abilities. Of these, besides other productions, are a "Journal of a Trip to Paris in 1814," and a "Tour through Belgium and the Rhenish Provinces in 1822," written by them both, and beautifully illustrated by the pencil of the Duchess, and some other exquisite productions by her Grace.

In November, 1839, the Duke had the honour of receiving a visit from the Queen Dowager, who, together with the Duke and Prince George of Cambridge, was entertained for several days, in his usual style of princely hospitality. But a still greater honour was conferred on the Duke in December, 1844, by a visit from the Sovereign and the Prince Consort, who had been just previously entertained at Drayton Manor and at Chatsworth. The entertainments were on a scale of much splendour and magnificence. From this time his

Grace chiefly attended to his estates—to the promotion of agriculture (of which he was at all times the zealous patron), and to the numerous other duties incidental to his position.

With regard to his Grace's public and political life, he was in 1810 or 1811 a candidate for the Chancellorship of Cambridge University, in which he was defeated by Prince William, Duke of Gloucester. When his Grace had been fifty years Lord-Lieutenant of the county of Leicester, the magistracy, clergy, and gentry presented him with a complimentary address, and erected a statue in his honour at Leicester. In politics, the Duke was both by education and conviction a Tory, and gave a uniform and consistent support to his party on all important Church and State questions; and even the friendship of the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel, at a later period of his life, did not induce him to deviate from this course in any material degree. Though not in political office, there can be no doubt his Grace was frequently consulted by the Tory ministers of the day on measures of importance.

The Duke was of a tall and noble presence, exceedingly elegant and dignified in manner, and singularly courteous in his reception of those who had business with him.

The late Duke is succeeded in his title and estates by his eldest son, Charles Cecil John, Marquis of Granby, now in his 42nd year, Lord-Lieut. of the county of Lincoln, late member for South Leicestershire.

20. At Torquay, aged 76, John Clementson, esq., who held the office of Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms of the House of Commons for fifty years.

21. At Hampstead, aged 86, Haunah, widow of Samuel Hoare, esq.

— Aged 67, at Port Macquarie, Com. James Gordon, R.N. He served under Sir Samuel Hood at the reduction of the islands of St. Lucie and Tobago, and in the expedition to Egypt in 1807.

— In Australia, M. Bochsa, the celebrated harpist.

— At Thornes House, near Wakefield, in his 75th year, Benjamin Gaskell, esq., formerly M.P. for Maldon, elder son of Daniel Gaskell, esq., of Clifton Hall, near Manchester. He was first returned to Parliament for Maldon at the general election of 1806; but was unseated, with singular circumstances, on petition. At the general election which took place in May, 1807, on the dissolution of Lord Grenville's Go-

vernment, Mr. Gaskell again stood for Maldon, but was defeated. He was returned without opposition in 1812, and remained unopposed till he quitted the House of Commons in 1826.

Mr. Gaskell was a moderate Whig in politics. He was strongly opposed to the imposition of civil disabilities on account of religious opinions, and was a zealous friend to Catholic emancipation, supporting the various motions of Mr. Canning, Mr. Grattan, and Mr. Plunkett on that subject. He voted with Mr. Brougham on the question of education; with Lord John Russell and Mr. Abercromby for a temperate reform in the representation; and was a consistent supporter of Sir Samuel Romilly and Sir James Macintosh in their endeavours to mitigate the severity of our criminal code. He was generally disposed, however, to support the Government of the day in all matters affecting the honour and security of the country, and was always ready to place a generous construction upon the motives and conduct of public men, never concurring in any proposition which had the appearance of vindictiveness, and rarely supporting any motion that went to harass or inculcate others.

In 1826 Mr. Gaskell retired from Parliament, and resided abroad from the summer of 1827 till the autumn of 1828. He afterwards resided chiefly at Thornes House, leading a life of quiet retirement and unostentatious goodness, to which there is no lack of those who can bear grateful testimony. Subsequently to the death of Mrs. Gaskell, in November, 1845, this disposition for retirement increased upon him; and his chief social intercourse was latterly that of his own hospitable dinner table and drawing room, where the ease of friendly intercourse was ever happily blended with the most graceful observances of wealth and station.

In 1807 he married Mary, the eldest daughter of the late Dr. Brandreth, of Liverpool. Their only surviving issue is James Milnes Gaskell, esq., M.P. for Wenlock.

22. Of paralysis, aged 43, Lord Henry Beauclerk, third son of William, eighth Duke of St. Alban's, and uncle to the present Duke.

24. At Ropley House, Alresford, Hants, aged 75, Captain the Hon. George Charles Agar, formerly of the 3rd Guards, next brother to the Earl of Normanton. He was unmarried.

DEATHS.—JAN.

24. At Brighton, aged 71, Frances, relict of William Atkins Bowyer, esq., of the Manor Estate, Clapham.

25. At Dover, Diana Félicité, eldest daughter of General Sir J. H. Littler, G.C.B., of Bigadon, Devon.

— At Exmouth, aged 88, la Comtesse de Vismes, widow of Colonel Count de Vismes, of the Coldstream Guards.

— At Tracy Park, Gloucestershire, aged 77, General Sir William Gabriel Davy, knt., C.B., K.C.H., Colonel of the 1st Battalion 60th Foot.

Sir William was the eldest son of Major Davy, of the Hon. East India Company's Service, who was Persian Secretary to the Right Hon. Warren Hastings. Having entered the army, he commanded the 5th Battalion of the 60th Rifles at the battles of Roleia, Vimeira, and Talavera, for which he received a medal and clasp, and was made a C.B. in 1815. Was appointed Colonel of a battalion of the 60th in 1842, and General in 1854. He received the honour of knighthood from King William IV. in 1836.

— After a long illness, in his 57th year, Mr. John Doubleday, for more than nineteen years attached to the Department of Antiquities in the British Museum.

Mr. Doubleday was originally a printer, and having for many years had much experience in the processes of casting in metals and other materials, he thereby acquired a knowledge, at once peculiar and practical, which became exceedingly serviceable in his subsequent pursuits, both in taking casts of antiquities and in the detection of forgeries. He established himself in private business as a copyist of coins, medals, and ancient seals; and, being resident in the neighbourhood of the British Museum, his talents were soon found to be eminently useful to that establishment, to which his services were permanently engaged. He was chiefly employed in the reparation of innumerable works of art, which could not have been intrusted to more skilful or more patient hands. His greatest triumph in this way was the complete restoration of the Portland Vase, after it had been wilfully broken into many hundred pieces.

26. At Candy, Ceylon, aged 68, Margaret, widow of Major Garvock, Assistant Adjutant-General at the Horse Guards.

— At Stockton Hall, near York, aged 70, Yarburgh Yarburgh, esq., of Heslington Hall, York, and Sewerby House, Bridlington, a magistrate and deputy-lieutenant

of the East Riding. High Sheriff of Yorkshire in 1848.

Mr. Yarburgh (then Mr. Greame) succeeded to the Heslington estates in 1852, on the death of his uncle, Nicholas Edmund Yarburgh, esq., and assumed by royal licence the surname of Yarburgh. Possessed of ample means, he liberally dispensed to the wants and necessities of the poor on his estates. He was a liberal contributor to all plans for the spread of the Christian religion, building a handsome Church at Sewerby, and having a large share in the restoration of the Priory church at Bridlington. Mr. Yarburgh was unmarried, and his estates descend to his sister, Mrs. Lloyd.

27. At High Beech, the Right Hon. Frances Cockburn Viscountess Valentia, only daughter of Charles James Sims, esq., married in 1837 to George-Arthur, Viscount Valentia (son and heir apparent of George second Earl of Mountmorris), who died without issue in 1841.

28. In Onslow Square, Brompton, aged 50, Isabella Mary, only surviving daughter of the late Granville Penn, esq., of Stoke Park, Bucks.

— At Carthagen, aged 37, Charles Walsingham Turner, esq., British Consul at that city, eldest son of the late Edmund Turner, esq., M.P. for Truro.

29. At Warsaw, Prince Ivan Fedorowitch Paskiewitsch.

He was born at Pultawa, of a noble and rich family, in 1782. In 1805 he first saw active service in the field, having been sent by the Emperor Alexander to the assistance of the Emperor of Austria against the French. He had at that time attained the rank of Captain. In 1806 he was with the army in Turkey, and in that long campaign distinguished himself by his military talents. He afterwards served in the campaigns of 1812-13-14 against the French.

War having broken out between Russia and Persia in 1826, the Emperor Nicholas, in compliance with the request of General Yermoloff, who commanded in chief the army of the Caucasus, sent General Paskiewitsch for his second in command, in which position he greatly distinguished himself. In the year following General Paskiewitsch succeeded Yermoloff in the chief command. He penetrated into the Persian territory, took several fortresses, defeated Prince Abbas Mirza, took possession of Erivan and Tauris, and forced by his rapid successes the Shah of Persia to

sue for peace, which was signed on the 19th February, 1828. As a reward for his services, the Emperor raised him to the rank of a Count of the Empire, with the surname of Erivanski, and gave him a million of roubles.

To the war against Persia succeeded that against Turkey, in which the Prince captured Kars and Erzeroum. The Emperor, who in the course of the campaign had already sent him the order of St. Andrew, named him Field-Marshal.

The death of Marshal Diebitsch, who sank in the month of May, 1831, beneath an attack of cholera, made a vacancy in the chief command of the army sent against the insurgent Poles. The Emperor Nicholas confided it to Marshal Paskiewitsch, who reached the seat of war in the month of June. The issue of the campaign is well known—the capture of Warsaw by the Russians, and the defeat of the Poles, notwithstanding their heroic resistance. Raised to the dignity of Prince of Warsaw, with the title of Highness, and the transmission of this title to his posterity, Marshal Paskiewitsch was also created Viceroy of the Kingdom of Poland, which post he held till his death.

He re-appeared twice after this conquest in command of an army; the first time being in 1849, during the Hungarian war, when Russia sent troops in aid of Austria, when the result of his operations was to compel the capitulation of the army of Georgey and the suppression of the insurrection; and the second time in 1853, at the siege of Silistria, where he received a wound which compelled him to retire. It is known that Prince Paskiewitsch was entirely opposed to the policy of the late Emperor and the views of those who sought the disruption of the ties which had so long bound Russia to the ancient monarchies of Europe.

29. At Ashhill Towers, co. Limerick, aged 82, Eyre Evans, esq.

— At York, aged 72, Thomas Price, esq., a deputy-lieutenant of the West Riding, a magistrate of York and of the liberty of St. Peter.

Mr. Price was the fourth son of Sir Charles Price, bart., of Spring Grove, Richmond, Surrey, an eminent banker, an Alderman and Lord Mayor of London, and M.P. for the City in three successive Parliaments. In early life he entered the army, and served in the Dragoons; but having married a Yorkshire lady he left the army and settled at York, in which he

engaged in some important commercial undertakings. He was managing director of the York City and County Bank, and chairman of the Yorkshire Fire and Life Insurance Company. In several other public companies he also took a prominent share in the direction, applying his active mind with energy to the promotion of any undertaking in which he embarked. Mr. Price was a very important and useful citizen of York, being a liberal and active supporter of all the religious and charitable institutions of the city, and his funeral was attended by a large concourse of the most influential inhabitants.

29. At Barnstaple, aged 64, George Hartwell Marsack, esq., second son of the late Charles Marsack, esq., formerly of Caversham Park, Oxfordshire.

30. At Bodysgallan, aged 74, Mary-Bridget, youngest daughter of the late Sir Roger Mostyn, bart.

31. At Playford Hall, Suffolk, aged 83, Catherine, widow of Thomas Clarkson, esq., the celebrated advocate of the abolition of the slave trade.

This venerable lady was a native of Bury St. Edmund's, the eldest of the six children of Mr. William Buck, a resident there of considerable influence. Mrs. Clarkson was for many years confined to the couch of an invalid, but yet, by her peculiar virtues, the fit companion, the solace, and the support of her husband in his long labours and trials. She was distinguished by her domestic qualities, her animation, and her colloquial eloquence. It was by these graces that, when Mr. Clarkson was compelled to suspend his labours and take up his residence in Westmorland, she, as well as her husband, obtained the warm and permanent friendship of Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Southey, the allied poets, and Charles Lamb, their congenial friend, as appears in numerous passages of their several works. She was by no means the passive comfort of her husband during his long labours. Mr. Clarkson, destined to the church by his education, had taken deacon's orders, when he renounced the functions of a clergyman, in order to discharge the special duty he had imposed upon himself. He had at the same time embraced opinions in favour of civil and religious liberty, which afforded a pretext to the supporters of slavery to accuse him of Jacobinism. Among the most active members of the Abolition body was Mr. William Smith, M.P. for Norwich, whose family were

DEATHS.—FEB.

through life the dearest friends of Mrs. Clarkson. When her health permitted she was the companion of her husband on his several missionary journeys. She attended him to Paris, when he in vain strove to obtain from the assembled sovereigns of Europe a declaration that the slave trade was piracy, and enjoyed with him his triumph at the close of his career, when he received from the hands of the Lord Mayor of London the record of his admission to the freedom of the City, in recognition of his Abolition services.

Mrs. Clarkson had been declining for some years, but her faculties remained sound till within a short time of her departure, which was without suffering, but not without hope. She attained an age beyond that given to mankind in general, and has left as large a number of friends, who honoured and loved her, as those can expect who survive their proper generation, the companions of their youth.

Lately. Aged 72, James Baillie Fraser, esq., of Reelick, co. Inverness, a deputy-lieutenant of that county.

This distinguished traveller and novelist was a Highland gentleman of good estate. In early life he was engaged in the civil service of the East India Company, in which he rose to distinction. Upon one occasion, while employed in a diplomatic mission, he rode on horseback from Constantinople to Ispahan, the fatigues and hardships of which journey gave the first shock to his vigorous constitution. When the Persian princes visited this country, he was requested by Government to accompany and take charge of them, and on their return he went with them as far as Constantinople. Mr. Fraser's health having suffered from the nature of the Eastern climate, he finally returned to England, and became a zealous improver of his Highland estate, which is almost unequalled, though on a limited scale, for its magnificent woods and romantic scenery.

In this retirement Mr. Fraser wrote numerous valuable works, all originating out of his personal history and experiences. In 1820 he published "A Tour through the Snowy Range of the Himalaya Mountains;" in 1825, "A Narrative of a Journey into Khorasan in the Years 1821 and 1822, including an Account of the Countries to the North-east of Persia;" and in 1826, "Travels and Adventures in the Persian Provinces." In 1828, like his contemporary Mr. Morier, he described the life and manners of the Persians, in a very popular novel, "The Kuzzilbash, a Tale of Kho-

rasan." In 1838 appeared his work, "A Winter Journey from Constantinople to Teheran, with Travels through various Parts of Persia." His last work was a memoir of the celebrated Colonel Skinner, who had been the intimate friend of his brother William Fraser. The latter had also risen to eminence in the Company's civil service, and was commissioner at Delhi, where he was assassinated by a native prince, in 1835. In 1823, Mr. Fraser married a daughter of Lord Woodhouselee, and sister of the late historian, Mr. Fraser Tytler.

FEBRUARY.

1. At Ham Common, Surrey, aged 79, John Lewis Cox, esq., formerly printer to the East India Company (as was his father before him), and the head of the firm of Cox and Sons, the eminent printers of Great Queen Street. Mr. Cox was one of the Court of Assistants of the Stationers' Company, of which he served the office of Master in 1849-50.

— In Harley Place, aged 47, Henry Pearson, esq., barrister-at-law, author or editor of several esteemed law books.

2. At Ramsgate, aged 71, William Fleetwood Varley, artist, youngest brother of the celebrated landscape painter. He was an artist of much merit, but his success was destroyed by a series of misfortunes. He lost his sight for some years by a needle shot from a crossbow by a school boy—he broke his right arm, which was unskillfully reset, and he was severely burnt in a frolic of some students at Oxford. He was, however, a very popular teacher, and was at one time much employed. His frequent misfortunes, however, had reduced him for some years to the deepest penury.

— In Lodge Place, St. John's Wood, Miss Isabella Heys, aunt to the Earl of Winterton, daughter of the late John Heys, esq., of Upper Sunbury Lodge, Middlesex.

— At the residence of her brother-in-law, Archdeacon Jones, Portland Place, Johannah Jane, wife of Sir J. Henry Pelly, bart.

3. Aged 84, Sarah, widow of Mr. Nehemiah Rogers, of Bury St. Edmund's, a descendant of John Rogers, the first martyr burned in the reign of Queen Mary. (?)

4. At Bath, aged 26, Frances Elizabeth, wife of Henry Calley, esq., of Burderop Park, Wilts, having given birth to a son and heir on the 25th of January.

DEATHS.—FEB.

4. At the vicarage, Middleton, Norfolk, aged 70, the Very Rev. Peter Scrimshire Wood, Dean of Middleham, Yorkshire, Vicar of Middleton, Norfolk, and Rector of Littleton, Middlesex, fifth son of Thomas Wood, esq., of Littleton, Middlesex.

— At Morrison's Hotel, Dublin, aged 54, the Right Hon. William Hare, second Earl of Listowel (1822), Viscount Ennismore and Listowel, county Kerry (1816), and Baron Ennismore, of Ennismore, county Kerry (1800), K.P., a Lord in Waiting to Her Majesty, and Vice-Admiral of the province of Munster.

His lordship was the eldest son of Richard, Viscount Ennismore (eldest son of William the first Earl), by the Hon. Catherine Bridget Dillon, eldest daughter of Robert, first Lord Clonbrock.

His father dying in 1827, he succeeded to the peerage on the death of his grandfather, July 13, 1837. He was appointed Vice-Admiral of Munster in 1838; and nominated a knight of the order of St. Patrick in 1839. In February, 1841, he was returned to the House of Commons as member for St. Alban's; again, at the general election in June of the same year, and remained in Parliament until the dissolution of 1847. His lordship twice held the office of a Lord in Waiting to Her Majesty.

Lord Listowel married in July, 1831, Maria Augusta, second daughter of the late Vice-Admiral William Windham, and widow of George Thomas Wyndham, esq., of Cromer Hall; and by that lady, who survives him, had numerous issue.

5. At Rose Castle, Cumberland, aged 71, the Hon. and Right Rev. Hugh Percy, D.D., Lord Bishop of Carlisle, Chancellor of Salisbury, a Prebendary of St. Paul's, F.S.A., brother to the Earl of Beverley. Dr. Percy was the third son of Algernon first Earl of Beverley, by Isabella Susannah, second daughter of Peter Burrell, esq., and sister to Peter first Lord Gwydyr. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge. Having married a daughter of Archbishop Mannors Sutton, he was by him collated in the year 1809 to the rectories of Bishopsbourne and Ivychurch. He became, in 1811, Chancellor and Prebendary of Salisbury; in 1816, a Prebendary of Canterbury and of St. Paul's; in 1822, Archdeacon of Canterbury; and in 1825, Dean of that cathedral church. He was consecrated Bishop of Rochester in June, 1827, and was translated to Carlisle in September in the following year. The

chancellorship of Salisbury, and the valuable prebend of Finsbury, in the cathedral church of St. Paul's, he retained until his decease. Dr. Percy was twice married: first, to Mary, eldest daughter of the Most Rev. Charles Mannors Sutton, Archbishop of Canterbury, by whom he had a numerous family; and secondly, February 3, 1840, to Mary, second daughter of the late Vice-Admiral Sir William Johnstone Hope. This lady died in November, 1851, without issue.

— At the Albany, Piccadilly, aged 48, George Arkwright, esq., M.A., barrister-at-law, a magistrate for Derbyshire, and M.P. for Leominster.

This gentleman was a great-grandson of Sir Richard Arkwright, the inventor of the spinning-frame, and the son and heir apparent of the present Robert Arkwright, esq., of Sutton Hall, near Chesterfield, by Frances Crawford, daughter of Stephen George Kemble, esq., of Durham. He was called to the bar by the Hon. Society of Lincoln's Inn, November 22, 1833.

At the general election of 1837, Mr. George Arkwright was an unsuccessful candidate for North Derbyshire. In February, 1842, he was returned for Leominster, and was re-elected in 1847 and 1852.

— Aged 59, Charles Thellusson, esq. He was the eldest son of Charles Thellusson, esq., brother to the first Lord Rendlesham, by Sabine, daughter of Abraham Robarts, esq., and was the last survivor of the persons designated in the famous will of his grandfather, Peter Thellusson, made in 1797.

6. At Torquay, aged 82, Eliza, relict of John W. Clough, esq., formerly of Oxton House and Newbald, county York, daughter of the late Rev. Sir Thomas Broughton, of Broughton and Doddington Hall, Cheshire.

8. In Grafton Street, aged 43, Sir Henry John Joseph Hunloke, the sixth Baronet (1642) of Wingerworth, county Derby.

9. At the Rectory House of St. Margaret's, Lothbury, in the city of London, in his 77th year, the Ven. John Banks Hollingworth, D.D., Archdeacon of Huntingdon, Rector of the united parishes of St. Margaret, Lothbury, and St. Christopher le Stocks.

— In Banchoory, Miss Mary Burnett, only surviving daughter of the late Sir Robert Burnett, of Leys, Bart., and sister of the present Sir Alexander Burnett, Bart.

— At Cumberland Terrace, Regent's Park, aged 77, Lady Emily Elizabeth Henry, daughter of William Robert, second Duke of Leinster. She married, March

DEATHS.—FEB.

13, 1801, the late John Joseph Henry, esq., of Straffan, county Kildare, Ireland.

10. On his passage home from Calcutta, aged 67, Sir William Henry Sleeman, K.C.B.

The deceased General entered the military service of the East India Company in 1808, so that he had devoted a life of nearly half a century to active employment in the East. For several years he discharged, with the greatest zeal and ability, the duties of British Resident at Lucknow, in the kingdom of Oude, and it is in connection with that country that his name will be longest remembered. In the earlier part of his official career he had been assistant in the Saugar and Nerbudda district, where he gained an immense amount of experience, and an accurate knowledge of Central India, which afterwards was turned to good account. In 1843 we find him British Resident at Gwalior; this appointment he held during the critical times which ultimately led to hostilities in that quarter, and resulted in the battle of Maharajpore. Soon after his arrival in India, Lord Ellenborough promoted Colonel Sleeman, who lost no time in proving that, if he had been an efficient servant in an inferior position, he was an able organizer and administrator as well. Colonel Sleeman was one of the very first persons who commenced suppressing the system known as "Thuggee;" and the official papers drawn up upon the subject were mainly the work of his pen; the department which was specially commissioned for this important purpose being not only organized, but worked by him. Such being his antecedents, it is not surprising, therefore, that Colonel Sleeman became intimately and extensively acquainted with the native character, and proved himself the right-hand man of Lords Ellenborough, Hardinge, and Dalhousie, the latter of whom frequently refers in dispatches to Colonel Sleeman's diary. Neither is it surprising that, in dealing with such a state as that of Oude, Lord Dalhousie should have looked to his Resident at Lucknow for trustworthy information and steady support. Colonel Sleeman had not resided in that capital without observing that its internal administration was hopelessly corrupt, and that no course appeared open to the British Government but one—namely, that of bringing it under British laws. Colonel Sleeman beheld a fertile soil looking like a desert, with villages plundered and deserted; a court wallowing in luxury and effeminacy; the minister careless and

negligent of all public duties; and the towns infested with murderers and assassins. In July, 1854, the Bengal "Hurkaru" states that "Colonel Sleeman, the able and cautious Resident at Lucknow," detected a letter sent from the King of Persia to his Majesty of Oude, in which the former monarch spoke hopefully of a Persian invasion of India, and "promised in that event to do all that he could for the stability of Oude." Only a few months before this an attempt was made by night upon the life of Colonel Sleeman himself in his own house, which attempt he only escaped by having fortunately changed his bed-room that evening.

Colonel Sleeman's health having failed, he retired to the hills, transacting his business by deputy, until he had the satisfaction of seeing that change accomplished which he had so long advocated—the annexation of Oude to the British territories. In recognition of his signal services in India, Her Majesty had just conferred upon Colonel Sleeman the dignity of a K.C.B.; but the distinguished officer probably did not live to learn this mark of Her Majesty's favour.

10. At Leamington, aged 90, the Right Hon. Grace, Countess of Farnham, only daughter of Thomas Cuffee, esq., of Grange, county Kilkenny; married in 1784 to John James, 4th Lord and 2nd Earl of Farnham, who died without issue in 1823, when the earldom became extinct.

11. At Curragh Chase, county Limerick, the dowager Lady De Vere, sister to Lord Monteagle.

12. At Blithfield, near Stafford, aged 82, the Right Hon. William Bagot, second Baron Bagot, of Bagot's Bromley, county Stafford (1730), and the seventh Baronet (1627), D.C.L., Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, and of the Linnæan, Horticultural, and Zoological Societies.

Lord Bagot was the third but eldest surviving son of William, first Lord Bagot, by the Hon. Louisa St. John, eldest daughter of John, first Viscount St. John. He was educated at Westminster School, and at Magdalene College, Oxford. He afterwards received the honorary degree of D.C.L. from that University, June 11, 1834.

He succeeded his father Oct. 22, 1798. His lordship was attached to agriculture and natural history, and to scientific and literary pursuits generally, and took small share in politics, but gave his vote to the Tory party.

Lord Bagot was twice married: first, in

1799, to the Hon. Emily FitzRoy, fourth daughter of Charles, first Lord Southampton; and secondly, in 1807, Lady Louisa Legge, second daughter of George, third Earl of Dartmouth, K.G.; by the latter lady he has left surviving issue.

13. At Harrowgate, aged 48, the Hon. Montagu Henley Ongley, next brother and heir presumptive to Lord Ongley.

15. At Leeds, aged 44, Edward Meynell, esq., barrister-at-law.

16. At Leamington, aged 69, Louisa Manners Sutton, eldest surviving daughter of the late Right Rev. Charles Manners Sutton, Archbp. of Canterbury.

— At Brighton, Sir Benjamin Fonseca Ontram, Knight, C.B., M.D., F.R.S., and F.G.S., of Hanover Square, London, and Kilham, county York, in the 82nd year of his age.

As a naval surgeon, he was fortunate enough to share in some brilliant actions, and received a medal and clasps for the actions in the *Nymphæ*, the *Boadicea*, and the *Superb*. He was appointed Inspector of Fleets and Hospitals in 1841, and in Sept., 1850, was nominated a C.B. and a Knight Bachelor.

— At his residence in Brompton Square, in his 85th year, Sir John Stoddart, knt., D.C.L., late Chief Justice of Malta.

Sir John Stoddart was the son of John Stoddart, Lient. R.N., descended from a Northumberland family. He was educated at Christ Church, Oxford, and in 1801 was admitted a member of the College of Advocates. In 1803 he was appointed by Earl St. Vincent, on the recommendation of Sir William Scott, to be King's Advocate and Admiralty Advocate at Malta; whence he returned in 1807, and resumed his practice in Doctors' Commons.

Dr. Stoddart, who had already had some concern in literary matters, now became a political writer, and became connected with *The Times* newspaper.

In 1812 he undertook to write the leading articles of that paper, and he continued to do so until the end of the year 1816: during which period his salary is said to have been 2000*l.* per annum.

In February, 1817, in consequence of some differences with one of the Proprietors of *The Times*, he established a new morning paper, called *The New Times*, which, though never very successful, continued to exist until 1823.

In his political principles Dr. Stoddart made Edmund Burke his model, and continually quoted his writings with admira-

tion. His censures on the conduct and policy of the Emperor Napoleon were remarkably energetic and persevering.

In the political satires and caricatures of that day, Dr. Stoddart was continually introduced as "Dr. Slop," and the pencil of George Cruikshank, when employed for Mr. Hone, frequently represented him.

In 1826 he was appointed Chief Justice and Judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court at Malta, and on that occasion received the honour of knighthood. He retained office until 1839, when he finally returned home.

In his retirement Sir John Stoddart continued his literary amusements, directing his attention chiefly to legal and social reform. He was one of the earliest promoters of the Law Amendment Society.

Sir John Stoddart married, in 1803, Isabella, eldest daughter of the Rev. Sir Henry Moncrieff Wellwood, bart., and has left a very numerous family.

17. Aged 82, John Braham, esq., the veteran vocalist. This favourite of three generations was born in London in 1774. By descent he was a German Jew; was left an orphan; it is said that in his boyhood he sold pencils in the public streets. However, he was still very young when he became the pupil of Leoni, an Italian singer of celebrity; and his first appearance in public took place nearly seventy years ago, on occasion of a benefit taken by his master.

"For the benefit of Mr. Leoni, at the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden, on Saturday, April 21, 1787, will be performed the Comic Opera called *The Duenna: Ferdinand*, Mr. Johnstone; *Isaac*, Mr. Quick; *Don Jerome*, Mr. Edwin; *Antonio*, Mr. Davies; *Lopez*, Mr. Wewitzer; *Carlos*, Mr. Leoni; *The Duenna*, Mrs. Wilson; *Louisa*, Mrs. Martyr; and *Clara*, Mrs. Billington. At the end of Act I. 'The Soldier tired of Wars' Alarms, by Master Braham, being his first appearance on any stage.' And again, after the first act of the farce, he sang the favourite song of "Ma chère Amie." At the opening of the Royal Theatre in Wellclose Square on the 20th June in the same year, "Between the acts of the play, 'The Soldier tired with Wars' Alarms' was sung with great success by a little boy, Master Abram, the pupil of Leoni," according to the *Chronicle*; and another paper said, "Yesterday evening we were surprised by a Master Abraham, a young pupil of Mr. Leoni. He promises fair to attain perfection; pos-

sessing every requisite necessary to form a capital singer." When he lost his boyish voice his future prospects appeared doubtful; but John Braham found a generous patron in Abraham Goldsmith, and became a professor of the piano. On his voice regaining its power he went to Bath, and there, in the year 1794, made his appearance at some concerts that took place under the direction of Rauzzini, who, appreciating his talent, gave him musical instruction for three years. In 1796 young Braham was engaged by Signore Storace for Drury Lane Theatre, and his *début* (which was in an opera called *Mahmoud*) was so successful, that in the year following he was engaged for the Italian Opera House. Hoping, however, to achieve a reputation more permanent than could be obtained by any other course, he resolved to visit Italy, and there to complete his musical education. His success in the Land of Song was so considerable that his fame travelled to his own country, and much curiosity was excited by his announced re-appearance at Covent Garden in 1801. This is the point from which may be dated his triumphant career. The opera in which he made his first appearance after his return was a work by Messrs. Mazzinghi and Reeve, entitled "The Chains of the Heart." For a series of years, terminating in 1816, he sang at the King's Theatre, in concert with Mesdames Billington, Foder, and Grassini. In 1809, having been engaged for the Theatre Royal, Dublin, for fifteen nights (for the sum of 2000 guineas), he was so successful, that his performances were prolonged to thirty-six. When Weber composed his opera "Oberon" for the English stage, Braham was the original Sir Huon. At the commencement of the present century, a vocalist who was at the same time an accomplished musician was a rare personage; and for many years Braham was without a competitor. After his voice had lost its original power, he was successfully engaged at several theatres on the mere strength of a reputation which seemed immortal; and his proficiency in singing Handel's works was universally acknowledged when his career as a popular vocalist had reached its termination. But, after all, the unbounded popularity which Braham so long enjoyed was derived not so much from his scientific skill as from the fact, that he expressed, in his well-known songs, with wonderful force and fire, the national feelings of his time. While his triumphs as a vocalist were without pre-

cedent, Mr. Braham was also successful as a composer. Not only did he write several of the most popular songs, but he composed a tolerably long list of entire operas. Of these the most celebrated were perhaps "The Cabinet" and "The Devil's Bridge," relics of which will be found in every old-fashioned music book. The only vocation which Braham attempted without success was that of manager. The St. James's Theatre, which he built as an opera-house, and which was first opened in 1836, was a failure. He also leased the Colosseum in the Regent's Park, which proved an equally unsuccessful speculation. In private life Mr. Braham was generally respected. He moved in good society; and among his acquaintance his fame as a man of extensive information, and as a humorous retailer of anecdotes, was scarcely inferior to his reputation as a vocalist. The large fortune which his genius and energy had once gained was lost by unfortunate speculation; but his declining years have been passed in the most cheerful comfort, secured to him by the care of his daughter.

17. Aged 42, John Sadleir, esq., M.P. for Sligo, a Director of the London and County Bank, of the Royal Swedish Railway Company, and of other enterprises of the same nature. This gentleman was the third son of Clement William Sadleir, esq., of Shrone Hill, near Tipperary, in which town a bank was established by his grandfather. He was born in 1814, and educated at Clongowes College. He succeeded an uncle in a very lucrative business as a solicitor in Dublin; which profession he continued to follow until 1846; having before that time become a Director of the Tipperary Joint Stock Bank, established about the year 1827, and in which the private bank founded by his grandfather was merged. Shortly before 1846 Mr. John Sadleir made himself known as an active parliamentary agent for Irish railways; and at the general election of 1847 he became himself a member of the legislature, being returned for Carlow. In the House, during the excitement consequent on "the Papal aggression," Mr. Sadleir was a distinguished member of the "Irish Brigade;" but he accepted the office of a junior Lord of the Treasury, on the formation of the Earl of Aberdeen's ministry in 1853. This entirely destroyed his popularity in Carlow, and with his party; and when he offered himself for re-election, having vacated his seat by his acceptance of office, he was de-

feated. In the same year he was elected for Sligo; but some disclosures which ensued caused the resignation of his office of Lord of the Treasury. The close of the career of this Irish adventurer is frightful—not merely from his own fate, but from the misery he brought on thousands. Mr. Sadleir, besides his chairmanship of the Tipperary Bank and the Swedish Railway, was engaged in a vast number of commercial undertakings, and in large speculative purchases under the Incumbered Estates Court. In all of these concerns he had perpetrated the most extensive frauds—he was indeed a swindler on the very grandest scale, and kept up the game to the last: when his last game was played and detection was inevitable, he committed suicide, under circumstances of the utmost deliberation: his corpse was found on Hampstead Heath. Owing to the self-destruction of this infamous man, the extent of his frauds will probably never become public, and the extent of misery caused by his depredations will remain unknown to the world. [See “CHRONICLE” of this date.]

18. At his seat, Bigadon, in Devonshire, aged 73, Lieut.-Gen. Sir John Hunter Littler, G.C.B., colonel of the 36th Bengal Native Infantry. He was the eldest son of Thomas Littler, esq., of an ancient Cheshire family. His maternal grandfather was a Director of the East India Company; and, receiving a cadetship from him in 1800, he took his passage to India in the *Kent* East Indiaman; this ship was captured on the voyage by a French privateer, when the passengers were placed in a small pinnace, and left to make their way to India as they could, which they fortunately succeeded in accomplishing. Mr. Littler served in the campaigns of 1804 and 1805 in Upper India under Lord Lake; and in the expedition against the isle of Java in 1811, and took part in the assault and capture of Batavia and Fort Cornelius. On the restoration of Java to the Dutch in 1816 he returned to Bengal, and was placed on the staff of the Marquess of Hastings, then Governor-General. Having attained the rank of Major-General in April, 1843, he was placed over the garrison and district of Agra. In November of the same year he was selected to lead the army of Gwalior. On the 29th Dec. following the troops under his command brilliantly carried the batteries of Maharajpore and Chounda. During the engagement he was slightly wounded, and had two horses shot under him. On

this occasion he received the thanks of Parliament, and was nominated a K.C.B. In 1845, in the first Sikh campaign, he for some time held Ferozeshah with 7000 troops against 50,000 Sikhs; and, on the 20th of September, opened communications with the main body of the army under Sir Henry Hardinge, by a movement well conceived and admirably executed. At the battle of Ferozeshah he again had two horses shot under him, and his Aide fell by his side. He was a second time thanked by Parliament, and was created G.C.B. In the following year he was appointed a Provisional Member of Council in India. In 1847 he was intrusted with the chief command of the troops beyond the Sutlej, and in 1849 he became President of the Council, and Deputy-Governor of Bengal. The inhabitants of Calcutta presented to him a service of plate, accompanied by an address. He returned to England in 1851; and latterly lived in retirement at Bigadon. In 1827 he married Helen Olympia, only daughter of the late Colonel Henry Stewart, and has left issue.

18. At Arundel Castle, in his 65th year, the Most Noble Henry Charles Howard, thirteenth Duke of Norfolk (1483), Earl of Arundel (1139), Earl of Surrey (1483), Earl of Norfolk (1644), and Baron Fitz-Alan, Clun and Oswaldestre, and Maltravers (1330), the premier Duke and Earl in the peerage of England next the Blood Royal, Earl Marshal and hereditary Marshal of England, a Privy Councillor, K.G. and F.R.S. His grace was born on the 19th August, 1791, the only child of Bernard-Edward, twelfth Duke of Norfolk, by Lady Elizabeth Belasyse, third daughter of Henry, second and last Earl of Fauconberg. When the Roman Catholic Relief Bill passed in the year 1829 the Earl of Surrey was the first of his communion to take his seat in the House of Commons, being returned for the borough of Horsham; he was re-elected for that borough in 1830 and 1831. In Dec. 1832, he was elected for the Western Division of Sussex, and again in 1835 without opposition; and in 1837 after a contest. In 1837 he was appointed Treasurer of Her Majesty's Household, and was sworn a Privy Councillor. He exchanged to the office of Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard in June, 1841; and resigned with the Melbourne Ministry in September of the same year. In June, 1841, he was called up to the House of Lords in his father's barony of Maltravers. On the 16th March, 1842,

DEATHS.—FEB.

he succeed to the dukedom. In July, 1846, the Duke of Norfolk was appointed Master of the Horse, which office he held until Feb. 1852. His grace was elected a Knight of the Garter in 1848. In Jan. 1853 he became Lord Steward of the Household; but in Jan. 1854, he relinquished that office to Earl Spencer. His grace was, as these appointments show, a member of the great Whig party. He was educated in the Roman Catholic faith; but on occasion of the "Papal Aggression" felt so keenly (as did others of the Roman Catholic nobility) the attack upon the liberties of his country, that he not only voted in support of the Government measures, but quitted the Roman communion and conformed to the Established Church. The clerical journal, *The Record*, congratulates its readers that his grace died in steadfast adherence to the reformed faith; but another authority asserts that his grace "was restored on his death-bed, and in his last moments, to that fold which he scandalised by his temporary apostacy." And it is further stated that, from the Rev. M. A. Tierney, the Roman Catholic pastor of Arundel, the Duke received the sacrament of extreme unction, and that fact is affirmed on his coffin-plate—"qui sacramentaliter absolutus, et unctionis sacræ præsidio munitus, ex hac vita migravit." His grace was an excellent landlord, and was universally beloved by his tenant-farmers. He was a warm advocate for agricultural improvement, farmed largely himself, and his home domain was a model for the neighbourhood. His grace married, Dec. 27, 1814, Lady Charlotte Sophia Leveson-Gower, eldest daughter of George Granville, first Duke of Sutherland, K.G.; and by her grace, who survives him, he had issue three sons and two daughters. The present Duke was born in 1815, and married in 1839 Augusta Mary Minna Catherine, youngest daughter of the present Admiral Sir Edmund Lyons, Bart., G.C.B., then British Minister at Athens, and now Commander-in-Chief of the Mediterranean Fleet. They have issue two sons and five daughters. The remains of the late Duke were consigned to the family vault in the Fitzalan chapel of the parish church of Arundel. The funeral was considered private; but much ceremonial necessarily attended it by the presence of the heralds pursuivants, and other officers of the College of Arms, of which his grace, as Earl Marshal, was the head. The mourners were men of the

very highest rank as members of the Howard family; and a large body of wealthy tenantry joined in the funeral procession.

19. At Morwick Hall, Northumberland, Lieut.-General Sir John Grey, K.C.B., colonel of the 5th Foot. He was the younger son of Charles Grey, esq. of Morwick. He entered the army in 1795. In the campaign against Tippoo Saib he fought at the battle of Mallavelley, and at the siege of Seringapatam, and received a medal for the latter. He served in the Peninsula, and was twice wounded at Ciudad Rodrigo. His gallantry afterwards found a field for its exercise in India. In command of the left wing of the army of Gwalior, he defeated a Mahratta force of 10,000 men at Punniar, and captured all their guns, standards, ammunition, and treasure. For this success he was nominated a K.C.B. in 1844. In 1845-6 he commanded a division in the battles of the Sutlej. He was appointed colonel of the 5th Foot in 1849, and became a Lieut.-General in 1851. He was Commander-in-Chief of the East India Company's forces in Bombay, and Second Member of Council there, from 1850 to 1852. Sir John Grey married, in 1830, Rosa Louisa, only daughter of Captain Sturt, R.N., but had no issue.

21. At Stourbridge, in his 53rd year, Robert Scott, esq., a magistrate of the counties of Worcester and Stafford, and a deputy-lieutenant of the former; formerly M.P. for Walsall; youngest son of the Rev. Charles Wellbeloved of York; but, on his marriage with Sarah, the only child of John Scott, esq., of Stourbridge and Great Barr, he assumed the name and arms of Scott. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple, Jan. 23, 1829; and was a Commissioner of Bankruptcy under the statutes repealed in 1842.

22. In Kingston, at an advanced age, the Hon. Mrs. George Gore, relict of the Very Rev. the Dean of Killala.

23. At Bristol, aged 54, Colonel John Frederic Sales Clarke, Commanding the South Wales District, and lately Assistant-Quartermaster-General at the Horse Guards.

24. At Temple Hill, East Budleigh, Miss Grace Chard Elford, eldest daughter of the late Sir Wm. Elford, of Bickham, Bart.

25. At Malta, in his 42nd year, John Renton Campbell, esq., of Lamberton and Mordington, co. Berwick; he was M.P. in 1847 for Berwick-on-Tweed.

— In Bedford Place, Kensington, aged 58, George Don, esq., F.L.S., the last of a

well-known family of botanists. Mr. Don was a brother of the late David Don, librarian and curator of the Linnean Society, and latterly Professor of Botany in King's College, and both were sons of Mr. George Don, of Forfar, an admirable field botanist of the old school, to whom we are indebted for the discovery of many interesting plants of the Highlands, communicated in letters to Sir James Smith, author of the English Botany. Mr. George Don, the son, was born in Forfar, in 1798, and commenced his scientific career as an assistant in the Botanic Garden, Chelsea. He subsequently travelled as collector of the Horticultural Society in Brazil, in the West Indies, and in Sierra Leone, and added largely to their collections, both of living and dried plants. Mr. Don's principal work was a General System of Gardening and Botany, founded on Miller's Gardener's Dictionary. In 1855 he assisted Mrs. London in editing a new edition of her late husband's Encyclopedia of Plants.

25. At Kingston, Surrey, Rear-Admiral John Hardy Godby. Admiral Godby was a son of John Godby, esq., Steward of Greenwich Hospital. He entered the navy in 1794, and, after other services, served in the *Nymphæ* 36, which, in company with the *San Fiorenzo* 36, captured the French frigate *La Résistance* 48, and *La Constance* 24, March 9, 1797. He afterwards saw much active service in various ranks, having been on full pay seventeen years, without interruption.

26. At Camberwell, Surrey, aged 77, Colonel Henry Thornton, C.B., late of the 82nd, and formerly of the 40th Regiment.

27. At Crewkerne, aged 60, Rear-Admiral Joseph Symes. This officer was nephew to the late Admiral Sir William Domett, G.C.B. He entered the navy in 1801, and fought at Trafalgar in the *Tonnant* 80. In 1809 he served as lieutenant in the *Bonne Citoyenne* 20, which had a fight of nearly seven hours with *La Furieuse* of the same force, and at length captured her. For his conduct in the combat Mr. Symes was promoted to the rank of commander as soon as he had completed his two years as lieutenant. He afterwards saw much active service.

28. At Torquay, from the effects of over-exertion with the Baltic Fleet, aged 21, Herbert William Wilberforce, lieutenant R.N., eldest son of the Bishop of Oxford. He served during the last and the present year as lieutenant in the Baltic.

— At Sebastopol, aged 27, Brevet-Major George Ranken, Royal Engineers,

killed by an accidental explosion at the destruction of the Karabelnaia barracks. He conducted the assaulting party on the Redan on the memorable 8th of September, and obtaining his company on the 25th of the same month, was raised to the brevet rank of major for his conduct on that occasion.

29. In Harley Street, aged 58, Sir James Eglinton Anderson, knt., M.D., M.R.I.A.

Lately. At his residence, Grantham, Sydney, New South Wales, aged 62, Philip Parker King, Rear-Admiral of the Blue, F.R.S., F.L.S., &c. Admiral King was the son of Philip Gidley King, esq., post-captain in the Royal Navy, who, from the ability he exhibited in the settlement of Norfolk Island, was appointed to succeed Captain Hunter in the government of New South Wales, and accordingly assumed the position of Governor in the month of September, 1800, on the departure of Governor Hunter for England. Admiral King was born at Norfolk Island in 1793, and entered the navy in 1807, and in the lower rank of the service was constantly engaged, and highly distinguished himself by gallantry and enterprise. He became a lieutenant in 1815, and in 1817 was entrusted with the conduct of an expedition having for its object a survey of the coasts of Australia, a service on which he continued employed in the *Mermaid*, cutter, and *Bathurst*, sloop (to the command whereof he was promoted by commission, dated July 17, 1821), until his return to England in 1823. The results of this exploration were very valuable as regards the ultimate settlement of our magnificent colonies in that quarter. Mr. King published an interesting narrative of his adventures, and his charts were published by the Admiralty. In September, 1825, from the feeling of confidence with which he had impressed the Admiralty, in the discharge of his late duties, he was appointed to the *Adventure* sloop, and ordered to survey the southern coast of America, from the entrance of the Rio Plata, round to Chiloe, and of Terra del Fuego. He was paid off on his arrival in England, November 16, 1830, and was not afterwards employed. His post-commission bears date February 25, 1830. On his retirement from active service Captain King returned to Australia, and shortly after his arrival succeeded Sir Edward Parry as manager of the affairs of the Australian Agricultural Society, the duties of which office he discharged with

DEATHS.—MARCH.

characteristic and exemplary ability and attention for several years. He was appointed a nominee member of the Legislative Council by the late Governor, Sir Charles Fitzroy; but latterly he held his seat in the House in the more honourable capacity of a representative member. As a legislator, Admiral King pursued the interests of the colony with the same earnestness and zeal that had characterised his earlier explorations in those interesting regions. Captain King had just attained the rank of Admiral of the Blue, and being the first native of the colony who had reached that rank, the event gave no small satisfaction. It is somewhat singular that Australia should have lost its two great explorers—Sir Thomas Mitchell and Admiral King—within a few months.

MARCH.

3. Aged 62, at Harley House, Brunswick Place, Regent's Park, His Excellency Don Francisco Luciano de Murrieta, Knight Grand Cross of the Spanish Order of Charles III.

5. At Norwich, aged 71, Lewis Evans, M.D., Physician to the Forces, and a Peninsular medallist of eight clasps.

— At Cheltenham, aged 80, General George Wright, Colonel Commandant of the Royal Engineers. He served in the West Indies from 1800 to 1805, and shared in the capture of St. Lucie and Tobago. He also served in North America and Canada, and was Deputy Quarter-master-general in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. He volunteered his services to Ceylon during the rebellion in the Kandian provinces, and paid an official visit to the Court of Persia. He was appointed Colonel Commandant of Royal Engineers, 1851.

6. At Great Malvern, aged 72, Thomas Attwood, esq., formerly M.P. for Birmingham. Mr. Thomas Attwood was the third son of Matthias Attwood, esq., of Hales Owen, who realised a large fortune by a monopoly of Swedish iron, and founded the house of Attwoods, bankers, in Birmingham, and in Gracechurch Street, London. Mr. Thomas Attwood first became known as a public character by his vigorous opposition to the Orders in Council of 1812. He was one of the first persons in the country who decidedly condemned the return to cash payments at the end of the war. His earliest productions on this sub-

ject bear the dates of 1815 and 1816, and the doctrines he advocated in favour of paper money he maintained to the last. The denial of his currency reforms made Mr. Attwood a Parliamentary Reformer; and at the close of the year 1829 he formed the Birmingham Political Union, which became a political engine of formidable power, and considerably influenced the passing of the Reform Bill. On that ground, he was presented with the freedom of the City of London, on which occasion he remarked,—“I may have given offence to abler men, because I had recourse to measures which trenched on the verge of law; but I did not resort to such measures until I saw that the extremity of the country required extreme remedies. It has been the study of my life to show attachment to the law, to the Crown, to the Lords and Commons, and the institutions of this great country.” Happily, by the judicious and moderate management of that dangerous instrument, and the timely concessions of the legislature, the crisis passed away. When the Reform Act had given two members to Birmingham, Mr. Attwood and Mr. Joshua Scholefield were returned without opposition at the general election of 1832; and in 1835 they successfully stood a contest, Mr. Attwood being at the head of the poll. When Mr. Attwood had sat some years in Parliament, he began to perceive that the reformed House of Commons was not more disposed to accept his currency theories than the unreformed, and he thought also that it had shown a decided inability and disinclination to grapple with great questions. He therefore retired from the House, by accepting the stewardship of the Chiltern Hundreds, in January, 1840, and was succeeded by his friend and associate in the Union, Mr. Muntz. Had Mr. Attwood died in 1832, his death would have been regarded by thousands as an important event, but in 1856 the place which he once occupied in public attention has been filled up by others; and as his later years had been afflicted by paralysis, Mr. Attwood had almost disappeared from public life.

6. At the Deanery, Carlisle, aged 5, Charlotte; on the 11th, aged 19 months, Susan Elizabeth Campbell; on the 20th, aged 3 years and 8 months, Frances Alice Marian; on the 25th, aged 10 years, Catharine Anna; and on the 8th of April, aged eight years and nine months, Mary Susan, five daughters of the Very Rev. Archibald Campbell Tait, Dean of Carlisle—all of scarlet fever.

DEATHS.—MARCH.

6. At Harehope, Northumberland, Oswin Addison Baker Cresswell, esq., eldest son and heir of Addison John Baker Cresswell, esq., of Cresswell.

8. At the Rectory House, Whepstead, near Bury St. Edmunds, in his 84th year, the Rev. Thomas Image, M.A., F.G.S., Rector of Whepstead and Stanningfield, Suffolk. This gentleman was a very eminent geologist, and by skill and perseverance had made nearly the finest collection in England. This valuable aid to science he has recently transferred to the Woodwardian Museum at Cambridge.

— Aged 75, at Brislington, Major-Gen. James Cambell, late Lieut.-Col. of the 51st Regiment of Light Infantry.

9. At Nice, aged 55, the Hon. Thomas Liddell, second son of the late Lord Ravensworth.

10. At Mayo, aged 78, the Hon. Frederick Cavendish, son of the Right Hon. Sir Henry Cavendish and Sarah Baroness of Waterpark.

11. At Acton Burnell, Shropshire, in his 69th year, after a long illness, Sir Edward Joseph Smythe, bart., the sixth Baronet (1660-1), of Eske Hall, county Durham, High Sheriff of Shropshire in 1831.

— In Blomfield Terrace, Harrow Road, aged 35, James Beatty, esq., engineer-in-chief of the Crimean railways.

12. At Camberwell, aged 39, the Hon. Robert Rutledge Craig, Her Majesty's Attorney-General and Queen's Advocate of British Guiana.

— At Eastbourn, aged 79, Major Leonard Kilham Willard, 11th Battalion Royal Veterans, a magistrate for Sussex; supposed to be the last survivor of the army that fought at the battle of Laswarree, in the East Indies, under Lord Lake, in 1802.

— At Hedsor Lodge, near Maidenhead, aged 78, the Right Hon. George Irby, third Baron Boston, of Boston, co. Lincoln (1761), and the fourth Baronet (1704), D.C.L. He succeeded to the peerage on the death of his father, March 23, 1825. Lord Boston married, in 1801, Rachel Ives, eldest daughter and coheir of William Drake, esq., of Amersham, and by that lady, who died in 1830, he had a numerous family.

13. Of bronchitis, in his 66th year, Mr. Robert Cruickshank, elder brother of George Cruickshank. Robert had some share of his brother's talent, and illustrated several works in the same, but much inferior, style of humour.

13. At Clarges Street, aged 68, the Hon. George O'Callaghan, only brother of Viscount Lismore.

16. At Coed Ithiel, Monmouthshire, in his 78th year, Richard Howell Fleming, esq., Captain in the Royal Navy, K.F.M., K.M.L., a magistrate for that county. Captain Fleming entered the navy in 1793, and served at the reduction of the French West India Islands in 1794, and in other expeditions, during which he was more than once wounded.

— At Plymouth, aged 75, William Love Paterson, esq., a retired Commander R.N. He was present at the capture of the *Mahonese* Spanish frigate of 34 guns, and of *La Vestale*, a French frigate of 36 guns.

17. At Bishopston, the wife of the Right Rev. Alex. Ewing, D.D., Bishop of Argyle.

— At Southend, Essex, aged 82, Sarah, widow of Rear-Admiral Bingham, of Grove House, Lymington, daughter of the late Vice-Admiral Sir William Parker, bart.

18. At Valetta, Malta, aged 67, the Right Hon. Sir Henry Pottinger, Bart., G.C.B., Lieut.-General in the East India Company's service. Sir Henry was the fifth son of a family of some standing in the county of Down. He went to India in 1804 as a cadet on the Bombay establishment, and at an early age attracted the attention of the civil and military authorities there by his energy, information, and ready administrative powers. During his long sojourn in that country he was employed in almost every branch of the public service. He was for more than seven years Judge and Collector at Ahmednuggar, in the Deccan, and for fifteen years more he filled the post of Political Resident at Cutch and Scinde; during part of the latter period he was also President of the Regency in the former province. So high was the opinion at that time formed of his talents by Lord Auckland, the Governor-General of India, that when that nobleman was raised to the earldom, and General Keane to a barony, in Dec. 1839, after the Affghanistan campaign, Major-General Pottinger was raised to the baronetage, as a token of the appreciation felt in England of the services which he had rendered in the discharge of his difficult duties. Sir Henry Pottinger returned to England in 1840, having established a deservedly high reputation. In the same year, differences connected for the most part with the opium trade broke out between this country and China. Thereupon, early in 1841, Sir Henry was se-

DEATHS.—MARCH.

lected by Her Majesty's Government to discharge the office of a mediator, and was ordered to proceed to China as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, for the purpose of adjusting the matters in dispute. At the same time he was gazetted Superintendent of the British Trade in China. The successes of the English forces, who had already taken Canton, and soon after captured Amoy and Nankin, brought the Chinese into a mind for peace, and the great ability of Sir Henry Pottinger turned the occasion to the best use. The result was that treaty by which the Chinese empire was for the first time, though still but partially, thrown open to European enterprise. As soon as the news of this treaty reached England, Sir Henry was rewarded for his services with the Grand Cross of the Order of the Bath; he was subsequently appointed Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Island of Hong Kong, which post he held from April, 1843, to the spring of the following year, when he returned to England. In May, 1844, he was sworn a member of the Privy Council, and a pension of 1500*l.* a-year was settled upon him by a vote of the House of Commons. In Sept. 1846, he was again chosen for active service, being appointed to the Governorship of the Cape of Good Hope, in succession to Sir Peregrine Maitland, and he discharged that office with great address and energy through a very troubled period until Sept. 1847, when he was relieved by General Sir Harry G. W. Smith, G.C.B. In 1847 he went again to India, the scene of his early services, and held the post of Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Presidency of Madras until the year 1854, when he finally returned to England. In Nov. 1851, he was promoted to the local rank of Lieut.-General in India. Sir Henry Pottinger married, in 1820, the eldest daughter of Richard Cooke, esq., of Dublin, and has left issue.

18. In Eaton Place, the Hon. Lady Inglis Cochrane, relict of Admiral the Hon. Sir Alexander Inglis Cochrane, G.C.B., daughter of David Shaw, esq., and widow of Captain Sir Jacob Wheate, bart., R.N.

— In Upper Albany Street, Regent's Park, aged 84, Captain Charles Chamberlayne Irvine, R.N.

19. At Uppingham, Elizabeth, wife of the Rev. John Richard Blakiston, B.A., youngest daughter of Sir Edward Nicolls, K.C.B.

— At Brighton, aged 72, Sophia Louisa, youngest daughter of the Rev. Colston

Carr, and sister to the late Bishop of Worcester.

19. At the Heath, Boxmoor, Herts, aged 80, Lady Deacon, relict of Major-Gen. Sir Charles Deacon, K.C.B., and daughter of Thomas Day, esq., late of Watford, Herts.

21. At Government House, Devonport, aged 71, Sir Hyde Parker, the eighth bart. (1681), of Melford Hall, Sudbury, Suffolk, and Tatton House, Worcestershire, a deputy-lieutenant of the former county. He was the younger son of Sir Harry, the sixth Baronet, and succeeded to the baronetcy on the death of his brother Sir William, on the 21st of April, 1830. At the general election of 1832, Sir Hyde Parker was returned for the Western division of the county. He retired at the dissolution of 1835. Having died unmarried, he is succeeded in the baronetcy and estates by his cousin, Sir Richard Parker, son of the late Vice-Admiral Hyde Parker, who died in May, 1854, and grandson of Admiral Sir Hyde Parker, knt., lost at sea in 1783, who was a younger son of Vice-Admiral Sir Hyde Parker, the fifth baronet.

— Aged 53, Lucy Jane, only surviving daughter of Charles Bowring, esq., of Larkbeare, Exeter.

— At Quedgley Rectory, Gloucester, aged 70, Rachel, widow of the Rev. Charles Augustus North, Rector of Alverstone, and brother of the Earl of Guildford.

— In Chesham Place, aged 65, Eliza, widow of Sir George Wombwell, bart., of Wombwell, Yorkshire.

22. At Clapham, aged 81, John Reeves, esq., F.R.S., L.S., and Z.S., formerly in the service of the H.E.I.C. in China.

24. In Grosvenor Square, aged 67, Joseph Neeld, esq., of Grittleton House, a deputy-lieutenant of Wiltshire, M.P. for Chippenham, High Steward of Malmesbury, F.S.A. and F.L.S. Mr. Neeld was the eldest son of Joseph Neeld, Esq., of Gloucester Place, Marylebone, and grand-nephew of Philip Rundell, esq., of Ludgate Street, the eminent goldsmith, who died in 1827, and left to him the residue of his estate, amounting to between 800,000*l.* and 900,000*l.* Upon receiving this noble fortune, Mr. Neeld purchased the estate of Grittleton, the old mansion on which he has since rebuilt on a magnificent scale, and has collected in it invaluable treasures of art; in which he has munificently appreciated the genius of the English sculptors and painters.

25. At Norton Court, Kent, aged 76, the Hon. Anne Elizabeth, wife of the Right

DEATHS.—MARCH.

Hon. S. R. Lushington, eldest daughter of Gen. Lord Harris, G.C.B.

25. In Gloucester Square, Hyde Park, aged 35, Margaret Sophia, wife of William Alexander Mackinnon, jun., esq., daughter of the late Francis Wiles, esq.

27. In Grafton Street, Bond Street, aged 72, the Right Hon. Catherine, Countess dowager of Pembroke and Montgomery. Her ladyship was the only daughter of Simon Count Woronzow, some time Russian Ambassador in this country, and afterwards Viceroy of Southern Russia. She became the second wife of George Augustus, eleventh and late Earl of Pembroke, in 1808, and was left his widow on the 26th Oct. 1827. The Right Hon. Sidney Herbert, heir presumptive to the earldom, was her only son; her five daughters are married into the noblest families.

28. At Llanvoida, Shropshire, in his 73rd year, the Right Hon. Sir Henry Watkin Williams Wynn, knt., K.C.B., and G.C.H. He was the third son of Sir Watkin Williams Wynn, the fourth Baronet, by Charlotte, daughter of the Right Hon. Sir George Grenville, and aunt of the second Duke of Buckingham; and was brother to Sir Watkin Williams Wynn, who died in 1840, and to the Right Hon. Charles Watkin Williams Wynn. Sir Henry entered the Foreign Office as a clerk in 1799, and was selected by the late Lord Grenville, who was then at the head of the Foreign Office, as private secretary, to which appointment was added that of *précis* writer. In 1803, he was sent as Envoy Extraordinary to the Elector of Saxony, whence he returned in April, 1807. In the previous January he had been elected to Parliament for Midhurst, but he lost his seat by the dissolution in the same year. He did not resume his diplomatic functions till Feb. 1822, when he was appointed Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary in Switzerland; whence he was transferred in Feb. 1823, to Stutgard; and in Sept. 1824, to Copenhagen, when he was sworn of His Majesty's Privy Council. He discharged the delicate and difficult duties of British representative at Copenhagen with great tact and ability for nearly thirty years, and returned from his post only in the early part of 1853. Sir Henry received the honour of knighthood in 1831, from King William the Fourth, who also nominated him a Grand Cross of the Hanoverian Guelphic Order. He was nominated a K.C.B. in 1851. He married, Sept. 30, 1813, the Hon. Hester Frances Smith, sixth daughter of Robert,

first Lord Carrington, by whom he has left issue.

28. At the Rectory, Louth, Dundalk, the residence of his son the Rev. Somerset L. C. Townsend, D.D., at a very advanced age, Thomas Townsend, Esq., LL.D., father of the late Bishop of Meath. This gentleman was one of the few remaining members of the Irish Parliament, and was a decided anti-Unionist.

29. At his residence, Derrynoid Lodge, county Londonderry, aged 81, the Hon. Robert Torrens, one of the Justices of the Court of Common Pleas in Ireland. The deceased Judge was brother of Major-Gen. Sir Henry Torrens, K.C.B., and of the late Archdeacon Torrens.

30. On his voyage from Malta to Marseilles, aged 74, Rear-Admiral Sir William Symonds, knt., C.B., and F.R.S., late Surveyor of the Navy. Sir William Symonds was the third son of Captain Thomas Symonds, R.N., of an ancient Suffolk family. His name was borne, from 1785 until 1788, on the books of the *Soleby* and *Charon*, both commanded by his father. In the *London*, 98, flagship of Sir John Colpoys, he witnessed the capture, in April, 1795, of the French corvette *Le Jean Bart*, and the 40-gun frigates *La Gloire* and *La Gentille*, and took part on the 23rd of June following, in Lord Bridport's action with the French fleet off Ile de Groix. He subsequently saw much gallant service on the coast of Spain, the Channel, and other stations, and shared in the capture of many privateers, and smaller vessels of war. In the *Cambrian*, 40, Mr. Symonds accompanied the expedition sent under Sir E. Pellew and Major-General Maitland to co-operate with the French Royalists and Chouans in Quiberon Bay and the Morbihan. As lieutenant, he was in the *Belle-isle* at the blockade of Toulon, in the Mediterranean, and off Corunna, and in the *Scorpion* brig served in the West Indies in watching the movements of the celebrated French squadron under Rear-Admiral Willaumez, in which Jerome Bonaparte had embarked. He aided in the same vessel at the destruction of several forts on the Spanish main; and was in her at the capture of several famous privateers. He continued in active and successful service to the close of the war. In 1819, Lieut. Symonds was appointed magistrate and intendant of the police, and captain of the ports at Malta; and he remained in that port until appointed to the *Royal George* yacht, Jan. 1, 1825. On the 4th Oct. 1825, he was promoted to the rank of

DEATHS.—APRIL.

commander. About this period, he was allowed, under a very unusual penalty, to construct a corvette, the *Columbine*. His design, however, proved so successful, that he was promoted to post rank in reward. At the commencement of 1831, Captain Symonds was authorised to build as an improvement upon the *Columbine*, the 10-gun brig *Pantaloon*; the triumph of which vessel led to the construction under his superintendence, of the *Vernon* 50; *Vestal* 26; *Snake* 16, and others. On June 9, 1832, he was offered and accepted the appointment of Surveyor of the Navy, which he continued to fill until 1847. During his tenure of office, the vessels built from his designs proved excellent in every point; and as an acknowledgment of his great services, he received the honour of knighthood in 1836. He was elected a F.R.S. June 4, 1835, and nominated a C.B. on the civil division May 1, 1848. In 1854, he became a Rear-Admiral on the retired list.

30. Aged 71, the Lady Honora Elizabeth Hester Harvey, eldest daughter of Richard, seventh Earl of Cavan.

— At Zoanfques, France, aged 64, the Hon. Mortimer Rodney, brother of the late Lord Rodney.

31. Aged 68, Lieut.-Colonel Samuel Fox, of Foxland, St. Mary Church, Devonshire, formerly of the 30th Regiment, an old Peninsular officer. He was present at the defences of Cadiz and Tarifa, and Massena's retreat; received a medal for the action of Fuentes d'Onor, and also served nearly eleven years in the East Indies.

Lately. In Edinburgh, Elizabeth, relict of George Leckie, esq., of London, and sister to the late Francis Horner, esq., M.P.

APRIL.

2. At the Rhydd Court, near Upton on Severn, in the 64th year of his age, Sir Edmund Hungerford Lechmere, bart., High Sheriff of Worcestershire in 1852.

Sir Edmund was the second Baronet of this ancient family, being the eldest son of the late Sir Anthony Lechmere, the first Baronet, created in 1818, and of Mary, daughter and heiress of Joseph Berwick, esq., of Hallow Park, in the county of Worcester, who was the founder of "the Old Bank" at Worcester, of which the late Sir Edmund was at the time of his decease the senior partner. He was educated at Westminster School, and at Christ Church, Oxford. In 1819 he married the Hon. Maria Clara, one of the Maids of Honour to Queen Charlotte, daughter of the Hon. David

Murray, by whom he had a numerous family.

2. At Darlington, at an advanced age, Anna, relict of Joseph Pease, of Feethams.

— At Fronderw, Llanrwst, Denbighshire, aged 78, Lieut.-General Thomas Wilson, C.B., of Beaurepaire.

3. At Brighton, aged 63, Anne Elizabeth, wife of Lieut.-Gen. Sir Frederick Stovin, K.C.B. and K.C.M.G., second daughter of Sir Sitwell Sitwell.

— In Upper Grosvenor Street, aged 55, the Right Hon. George Robert Dawson, of Moyola Park, Castledawson, county Londonderry, Deputy Chairman of the Board of Customs. Mr. Dawson was educated at Harrow and Christ Church, Oxford, where he took a first class. In 1815, he was returned as member, in the Tory interest, for the county of Londonderry, which he represented until 1830; when, having supported the measure of Catholic Emancipation, he was compelled to retire; and was elected for the government borough of Harwich. Soon after being returned to Parliament, he married a sister of the late Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel, and from 1823 filled the post of Under Secretary of State for the Home Department, until January, 1828, when he was removed to the Secretaryship of the Treasury, a post which he held till the end of the Duke of Wellington's administration. He was sworn of His Majesty's Privy Council. On Sir Robert Peel's short return to office in November, 1834, he appointed Mr. Dawson Secretary of the Admiralty. In 1841, when Sir Robert Peel again took office, he accepted a Commissionership of the Customs, from which he was promoted some five years later to the Deputy Chairmanship of the Customs Board, which he held till the time of his death.

4. Aged 60, the Rev. Edward Beauchamp St. John, Rector of Ideford, Devon (1844), eldest son of the late Hon. George St. John, Colonel of the 73rd Highlanders.

— At Larkbeare, Exeter, aged 86, Charles Bowring, esq., father of Sir John Bowring, Governor of Hong Kong.

— At Kidbrooke Park, Tunbridge Wells, aged 15, Christopher Sullivan, youngest surviving son of Gen. Sir James W. Sleight, K.C.B.

5. Drowned by the upsetting of a boat, in the Thames, near Reading, aged 15, William, only surviving son of Sir Edward Borough, bart.

— At Kirkoswald, Cumberland, in consequence of an accident occasioned by the

DEATHS.—APRIL.

fall of a tree, aged 45, Timothy Fetherstonhaugh, esq. He was an acting magistrate, and Sheriff for the county in 1845. [See CHRONICLE of this date.]

7. At Weinheim, Baden, aged 15, Richard, only son of Richard Cobden, esq., M.P.

— At Southampton, aged 58, Col. Frederick Farquharson, late of the 7th Royal Fusiliers.

— At Eartham, near Chichester, aged 78, Mrs. Huskisson, widow of the Right Hon. William Huskisson, and daughter of the late Adm. Millbanke.

8. At Umritsur, Lahore, India, Major Anchitel Fenton Fletcher Boughy, 81st Regiment, son of the late Sir John Fenton Boughy, bart., of Aqualate, Staffordshire.

— At Allestree Hall, Derbyshire, aged 68, William Evans, esq., a magistrate and deputy-lieutenant of that county, and an alderman of Derby; late M.P. for North Derbyshire. Mr. Evans was the eldest son of William Evans, esq., of Darley, by Elizabeth, daughter of Jedediah Strutt, esq. Mr. Evans sat for the borough of East Retford, in the Parliaments of 1818 and 1820. In 1826 he contested the borough of Leicester, but unsuccessfully; but was returned in 1830 and 1831; and again after the Reform Act in 1832. In 1835, however, the two Liberal members were displaced by two Conservatives. At the general election of 1837, he became a candidate for North Derbyshire. He was re-elected in 1841 and 1847; and continued to represent that constituency until 1853, when he retired from parliamentary life. Mr. Evans served the office of High Sheriff of the county in 1829. "Mr. Evans's public life has been an eventful and busy one. His parliamentary career was marked throughout by the utmost integrity and consistency, whilst his municipal and magisterial duties have been uniformly discharged with strict justice and equity to all parties. In principle, open and generous; in politics, liberal and patriotic; in religion, strict and steadfast in the faith; in public life, honest, just, and truthful; and in private life, kindly, affectionate, and of the strictest morality." Mr. Evans married, in 1820, Mary, daughter of the Rev. Thomas Gisborne, of Yoxhall Lodge, Prebendary of Durham, and sister to the late Thomas Gisborne, esq., M.P. for North Derbyshire, and by her had issue an only son, who is now member for North Derbyshire.

9. In Connaught Place West, Hyde Park, aged 77, John Allcard, esq., of Burton Closes, Bakewell.

9. At Frenchay, near Bristol, aged 74, General John Greenstreet, H.E.I.C.S.

— In Manchester Square, in his 68th year, the Hon. William Harry Leslie Melville, Director of the East India Company, brother to the Earl of Leven and Melville.

11. At Greenham Lodge, Berks, aged 73, Major-Gen. Guy Carleton Coffin, R.A.

— At the United Service Club, in Queen Street, Edinburgh, in his 45th year, Charles Whitley Deans Dundas, esq., formerly M.P. for the Flint boroughs (1837). He was the elder son of Rear-Admiral Sir James Whitley Deans Dundas, G.C.B., late Commander-in-Chief in the Black Sea, and had served in the Coldstream Guards.

12. At the vicarage, Madeley, Salop, the following children of the Rev. J. H. Gwyther:—April 12, aged 10, Hepzibah Mary; April 13, aged 8, Emily Maria; April 14, aged 7, Phœbe Catherine; April 16, aged 5, James Bulkeley Philipps; April 21, aged 3, Clara Artemesia.

14. At Nynee Tal, aged 22, J. Murray Murray, esq., Lieut. 6th Regiment Light Cavalry, A.D.C., to his Honour the Lieut.-Gov. of the N.W. Provinces, Bengal, and eldest son of the late Adolphus Cottin Murray, esq., and Lady Murray, of Ardeley Bury, Herts.

— At his seat, Came House, Dorsetshire, aged 66, the Right Hon. George Lionel Dawson-Damer, a Privy Councillor and C.B., uncle and heir presumptive to the Earl of Portarlington, being the third son of John, first Earl of Portarlington, by Lady Caroline Stuart, daughter of John, third Earl of Bute, K.G. Together with his elder brother, the Hon. Henry Dawson, Captain R.N., he assumed the additional name of Damer, by royal sign-manual in 1829, on succeeding to a portion of the estates of his aunt, Lady Caroline Damer, a lady who attained some reputation as an amateur sculptor, and who was an intimate friend of Horace Walpole. In his youth he served in the 1st Dragoon Guards, and served in Flanders, and at the battle of Waterloo, for which he was made C.B. He retired from the army a few years afterwards. He represented Portarlington in the parliaments of 1835, 1837, and 1841, and Dorchester in 1847; but lost his seat at the general election in 1852, in consequence of his adhesion to the free-trade policy of Sir Robert Peel, under whom he had accepted the office of Comptroller of Her Majesty's Household, and the rank of Privy Councillor. Colonel Dawson Damer married, Aug. 20, 1825, Mary

DEATHS.—APRIL.

Georgiana Emma, second daughter of Lord Hugh Seymour, and has left issue.

15. At Maidstone, in his 50th year, the Right Hon. George Augustus Frederick Cowper, sixth Earl Cowper and Viscount Fordwich, co. Kent (1718), Baron Cowper of Wingham, in the same county (1706), the eighth Baronet (1642), and a Count of the Holy Roman Empire (1758); Lord Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of the county of Kent. His lordship was the eldest son of Peter Leopold Louis Francis, the fifth Earl, by the Hon. Emily Mary Lamb, eldest daughter of Peniston, first Viscount Melbourne, and now Viscountess Palmerston. He served for some time in the Royal Horse Guards Blue. At the general election of 1830 he was returned to Parliament for the city of Canterbury. In 1831 he was re-chosen without opposition; but in 1832 was forced to stand a poll by the impostor Sir William Courtenay, who, such was the extent of the delusion, polled 375 votes. In 1834, Lord Fordwich was appointed Under Secretary of State for the Foreign Department; but the ministry came to an end immediately afterwards. At the dissolution of 1835 Lord Fordwich retired from the House of Commons. He succeeded to the peerage on the death of his father, June 21, 1837; and in 1846 was appointed Lord Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of the county of Kent. Earl Cowper died very suddenly while attending the Maidstone Assizes. His lordship married, in 1823, Lady Anne Florence de Grey, eldest daughter of Earl de Grey, and heir presumptive to the barony of Lucas; and by that lady, who survives him, has issue.

16. In Harewood Street, aged 75, the Rev. Robert Walpole, Rector of Christ Church, Marylebone, and of Itteringham, Norfolk, eldest son of the Hon. Robert Walpole, Clerk of the Privy Council, and Envoy to Portugal, youngest brother of Horatio, first Earl of Orford of the second creation of 1806.

— At Cheltenham, aged 76, Cornelia, widow of the Rev. Edward Nares, D.D., Rector of Biddenden, Kent, and Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford.

19. At Thorne, Yorkshire, in his 83rd year, the Rev. Eric Rudd, incumbent of that parish, where he had resided 56 years, and Vicar of Appleby, Lincolnshire. Through his mother, Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Eric, only son of Kenneth Sutherland, third Lord Duffus, he was a claimant of that peerage; Kenneth Lord Duffus being concerned in the Rebel-

lion of 1715, forfeited his title and estates. In 1826 the title was restored, by Act of Parliament, to Captain James Sutherland, the uncle of the deceased clergyman; and on the death of the restored lord, without issue, in 1827, the deceased was, in right of his mother, one of the claimants of the title.

19. At Aldborough Manor, Yorkshire, the residence of her grandson Andrew Sherlock Lawson, esq., aged 85, Mariana, widow of Sir Thomas Sherlock Gooch, bart., of Benacre Hall, Suffolk, daughter of Abraham Whitaker, of Lyster House.

— At the Manor House, Thorpe, near Norwich, aged 63, Apollonia, youngest daughter of the late Rev. Philip Wodehouse, Prebendary of Norwich, and Rector of Hingham.

20. At Gosport, aged 74, John Mortimer, esq., M.D., Inspector of Hospitals and Fleets, and late Surgeon of the Royal Hospital at Haslar.

— At Upton, Essex, aged 71, Emma, relict of Sir John Henry Pelly, bart.

23. At Lower Grosvenor Street, aged 78, the Right Hon. Caroline Elizabeth Mary, Dowager Lady Wharnccliffe, only daughter of John, first Earl of Erne, by his second marriage with Lady Mary Hervey, daughter of the fourth Earl of Bristol. Her ladyship married, 30th March, 1799, James, first Lord Wharnccliffe, who, at his death, in 1845, was Lord Privy Seal in Sir Robert Peel's administration.

24. In his 90th year, Henry Clutterbuck, esq., M.D., of New Bridge Street, Blackfriars, Consulting Physician to the Peckham Lunatic Asylum, to the Royal South London Dispensary, and to the Western City Dispensary; formerly Physician to the General Dispensary, and Lecturer in the theory and practice of Physic, and President of the Medical Society.

— At Ceylon, aged 53, Sir William Ogle Carr, knt., Chief Justice of the Supreme Court at Ceylon. Sir William was called to the bar by the Hon. Society of Gray's Inn in 1826. Going to Ceylon, he was admitted King's Advocate there, and in December, 1839, he was appointed second Puisne Judge of the colony. In April, 1854, he was made Chief Justice of Ceylon, and created a Knight.

25. At Tatton Park, Cheshire, aged 74, Wilbraham Egerton, esq., a magistrate and deputy-lieutenant of Cheshire, and formerly M.P. for that county. Mr. Egerton was the eldest surviving son of William Tatton Egerton, esq., of Tatton and Withenshaw, of which ancient family he

was the representative. By the marriage of his grandfather, William Tatton, esq., with Hester, daughter of John Egerton, of Tatton, esq., the family became possessed of Tatton Park and the other Cheshire and Lancashire estates of the celebrated Lord Chancellor Ellesmere. On the 8th May, 1780, Mrs. Tatton, upon inheriting her brother's large possessions, resumed, by sign-manual, her maiden name, and dying on the 9th of July next following, was succeeded by her only son, William Tatton Egerton, of Tatton and Withenshaw, esq., M.P., on whose death, in 1806, the Egerton estates passed to his eldest surviving son, and the Tatton estates to his second son, who assumed the surname of Tatton. Mr. Wilbraham Egerton served the office of Sheriff of Cheshire in 1808. He was chosen member for the county at the general election of 1812, and represented the county during five Parliaments, until the dissolution of 1831, when, in consequence of the pressure of the Reform question, which he had constantly opposed, he was obliged to give way to George Wilbraham, esq., of Delamere, afterwards M.P. for the Southern division. However, in 1832, his eldest son was a successful candidate for the Northern division of the county, which seat he still retains. In Parliament Mr. Egerton was one of that respectable body "the country gentlemen," whose influence is so much more felt than seen; and this character was but a representation of his actual position, for a finer English country gentleman is seldom seen. As a landlord and a magistrate he commanded universal respect; and in all the relations of domestic and social life he has left an example which all would do well to imitate. He married, Jan. 11, 1806, his cousin-german, Elizabeth, second daughter of Sir Christopher Sykes, bart., of Sledmere, in Yorkshire, by Elizabeth, daughter of William Tatton, esq. By that lady, who died on the 28th Feb. 1853, he had many children.

25. At Villeneuve sur Yonne, in France, in his 35th year. John Fenwick Burgoyne Blackett, esq., of Wylam, Northumberland, late M.P. for Newcastle-on-Tyne.

26. At St. Leonards-on-Sea, aged 40, Richard Maxwell Fox, esq. of Foxhall, co. Longford, a deputy-lieutenant, magistrate, and M.P. for that county.

— Aged 75, John Rooke, esq., a magistrate of Cumberland. Mr. Rooke was a gentleman of much local importance, taking a very prominent part in county politics, and representing that portion of the Con-

servative party who advocated the views of Sir Robert Peel. He was consequently a firm supporter of Sir James Graham in all the county contests. Mr. Rooke was a man of extensive reading and much thought. He was the author of some works on political economy, and on geology, in the former of which sciences he supported the views of Mr. Attwood, and in the latter those of Mr. Crosse.

26. In Park Square, London, the Hon. Anna Maria, wife of Rear-Admiral Ryder Burton, K.H., aunt to Lord Dunsany.

— In Norfolk Street, Park Lane, aged 89, Amelia Alice Jane, relict of the Hon. and Rev. John Dymoke, of Scrivelsby Court, Linc., the King's Champion. She was the eldest and only surviving child of Admiral Elphinstone, who was Commander-in-Chief of the Russian navy.

27. At Loake's Hill, near High Wycombe, the Hon. Mrs. Crewe, sister to Lord Carington, aunt to the Earl of Stanhope, Lord Gardner, and the Dowager Lady Suffield.

28. At St. Helena, where he was obliged to be left on his homeward voyage from India, George R. Douglas, Captain Bombay Artillery, second son of the late Lieut.-Gen. Sir Niel Douglas, K.C.B. and K.C.H.

29. At Nice, aged 15, John Edward Benett, of Pythouse, Wilts, grandson of the late John Benett, esq., of Pythouse.

Lately. At Paris, Marianne, wife of Walter Long, esq., M.P., of Rood Ashton, Wiltshire, second daughter of the Right Hon. Archibald Colquhoun, Lord Registrar of Scotland.

Lately. At Edinburgh, aged 108, Mrs. Elizabeth Gray, or, as she was better known among her numerous friends, Miss Betty Gray. Her father, who died in 1755, left a widow and a large family, who have been remarkable for longevity. Mrs. Gray attained the age of 96; two of her daughters the ages of 84 and 96, and none of them have died under 70 years of age.

MAY.

1. In Berkeley Street, Berkeley Square, aged 71, George James Guthrie, esq., F.R.S., late President of the Royal College of Surgeons. Mr. Guthrie was the only son of Mr. Andrew Guthrie, at that time a celebrated chiropodist practising in Lower James Street, Golden Square. He was articled to Mr. Phillips, a surgeon practising in Pall Mall, and studied under Dr. Hooper, an able physician. In 1800, when just

DEATHS.—MAY.

15, the young student was appointed hospital assistant to the York Military Hospital, and became a member of the College of Surgeons when not quite 16. He was soon after appointed an assistant-surgeon to the 29th Regiment. From 1802 to 1807 he served in North America; in 1808 he landed with his regiment in Mondego Bay, in Portugal, and on the 17th of August was at the battle of Roleia. The 9th and 29th Regiments furnished the greater part of the wounded, who for three days were almost entirely under Mr. Guthrie's care. On the 21st of the same month he was at the battle of Vimiera. Mr. Guthrie was present at the taking of Oporto, and here he exhibited several examples of great presence of mind, especially in capturing a gun, which the French artillerymen were endeavouring to drag through a lane, when the young doctor, being the only mounted officer present, made a dash at the gun, and captured it; but what to do with it puzzled him; he therefore cut the traces of the headmost mule, a very fine one, brought her off as a trophy, and then sent a sergeant and a file of men to take charge of the gun until he could report its capture to Sir John Sherbrook, who was mightily amused at the doctor's capturing a gun by himself. He was present at the battle of Talavera, at the retreat of the British army across the Tagus—a most disastrous affair for the wounded, who were collected after several days' marching at the Convent of Deleytosa, near Truxillo, which Mr. Guthrie called the slaughterhouse of the wounded of the British army, from the loss of life which took place through the want of previous care and defective surgical knowledge. After the Peninsular campaigns, Mr. Guthrie returned to London with a large amount of practical experience, and commenced lecturing on surgery, which practice he continued for nearly thirty years, receiving large attendances of the medical officers of the army, navy, and the East India Company. He was elected assistant-surgeon to the Westminster Hospital in 1823, and full surgeon in 1827. In 1824 he was elected a member of the council of the Royal College of Surgeons, and in 1833 was elected to the highest office, that of President, an honour again conferred on him in 1842 and 1855, being the only instance at present on record of one person filling that office three times. Mr. Guthrie had also held the office of Professor of Anatomy and Surgery. The professional writings of this eminent surgeon are of the highest repute.

1. At the Baths Hotel, Helensburgh, on the Clyde, aged 86, Mrs. Bell, widow of Henry Bell, the man who first propelled a vessel by steam in British waters (?). Bell died in 1830, having been long dependent on an annuity of £50 per annum, granted by the Clyde Trustees, which was not only continued to his widow, but increased to £100.

— At Dublin, Maria Catherine Sandes, eldest daughter of the late Lord Bishop of Cashel.

— At Fulbourn, Camb., Cecil, widow of Richard Greaves Townley, esq.

2. At Rome, Selina Harriet, eldest surviving daughter of the late Sir Charles Wager Watson, bart., of Wrattling Park, Cambridge.

3. At Paris, aged 53, M. Adolphe Adam, a well-known musical composer. M. Adam was one of the most popular and voluminous composers of whom the French stage could boast; ballets, vaudevilles, and operettas, fell from his pen in showers; frequently would he be engaged on two or three operas and a ballet simultaneously. His most popular works are the operetta of *Le Châlet*, the *Postillon de Lonjumeau*, the ballet of *Giselle*, and the *Diable à Quatre*. Besides supplying every theatre in Paris with incessant contributions, M. Adam invaded the church, and wrote several masses and other sacred compositions.

4. In Lower Baggot Street, Dublin, Frances Anne, wife of Major-General N. Hamilton, K.H., daughter of the late Rev. Samuel Beamish, Mount Beamish, county Cork.

— In Kildare Terrace, Westbourne Park, Lady Nisbett, relict of Sir John Nisbett, of Deane, bart., N.B.

5. In Montague Square, aged 70, the Hon. Paulina, relict of Richard O'Ferrall Caddell, esq., of Harbournstown, co. Meath, younger daughter of Thomas Arthur, second Viscount Southwell.

6. At Edinburgh, aged 68, Sir William Hamilton, bart., Ph. D., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh. Sir William was the lineal representative of the Hamiltons of Preston, co. Haddington, the head of which family was created a baronet in 1673. The title, which had been dormant for some time, was assumed by Sir William in 1816. He was born in Glasgow on the 8th of March, 1788. After studying at the University of that city, he went to Oxford on the Snell foundation, where he obtained first-class honours. He was called to the

Scottish bar in 1813, and he held the office of Her Majesty's Solicitor for Teinds in Scotland. But it was to literature and philosophy that his studies were devoted. In 1821 he was appointed Professor of Universal History in the University of Edinburgh. This chair was little more than an honorary appointment; but in 1836 Sir William obtained the post for which his intellect was most fitted, and in which he attained a reputation equal to the deepest thinkers that have yet lived—the chair of Logic and Metaphysics. Under Sir William Hamilton, the class, which had long been a mere appendage to the theological course, assumed a new importance, and Scotland as a school of metaphysics regained the renown it had lost since the days of Dugald Stewart. By his papers in the *Edinburgh Review*, extending from the year 1829 to 1839, Sir William Hamilton became known to philosophers on the Continent, and his fame abroad was higher than even in his own country. In 1852 a volume of his essays, consisting chiefly of articles reprinted from the *Edinburgh Review*, was published under the title of "Discussions in Philosophy, Literature, Education, and University Reform." In 1846 Sir Wm. edited the works of Dr. Thomas Reid, the labour of many years of patient and profound thought. For some years he had been engaged on an edition of the collected works of Dugald Stewart, the first volume of which appeared in 1854.

6. At Bassett Down House, Swindon, aged 68, Anne Elizabeth Cunningham, eldest daughter of the late Rear-Admiral Sir Charles Cunningham, K.C.H.

— At Mitre Court Buildings, Temple, aged 52, Jonas Alleyne Maynard, esq., barrister-at-law.

— In Upper Wimpole Street, aged 79, Ann, widow of Henry Revell Reynolds, esq., Chief Commissioner of the Insolvent Debtors' Court.

7. At Bath, aged 76, Lady Berry, widow of Rear-Admiral Sir Edw. Berry, bart., K.C.B.

9. At Ryde, Isle of Wight, aged 91, Grace, widow of Colonel Kent, and mother of the late gallant Colonel W. H. Dennie, 13th Light Infantry.

— At Peover Cottage, aged 69, Caroline Leigh, youngest daughter of the late, and sister of the present, Egerton Leigh, esq., of High Leigh and Joddrell Hall, Cheshire.

11. At Dublin, aged 76, Sir Edward Tierney, bart., of Churchtown and Kan-

turk, county of Cork, for many years Crown solicitor for the North-West Circuit of Ireland, and Clerk of the Assizes in the Rolls Court. Sir Edward Tierney was the brother of Sir Matthew Tierney, one of the physicians of George IV., upon whom the baronetcy was conferred.

— At his residence in Brook Street, London, aged 83, the Right Hon. Edward Digby, second Earl of Digby, county Lincoln, and Viscount Coleshill, county Warwick (1790), and Baron Digby of Sherborne, county Dorset (1765), and eighth Baron Digby of Greshill, in the King's County (1620), Lord Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of Dorsetshire, and D.C.L. His lordship, who succeeded to the title in 1793, took little part in politics, but gave his support to the Tory party. His lordship died unmarried, and the earldom has become extinct; but the Irish barony devolves on Edward St. Vincent Digby, esq., of Mintern House, Dorsetshire.

12. At Ferns, Ireland, aged 71, the Rev. Henry Moore, Rector of Kilbride and Ferns, heir presumptive to the earldom of Drogheda.

— At the residence of her father, at Nassau, New Providence, aged 29, Marianne Hamilton, wife of the Rev. Robert Swann, Rector of Christ Church, and eldest surviving daughter of the Ven. John M. Trew, D.D., Archdeacon of the Bahamas.

14. At his chambers in the Temple, Charles Bellamy, esq., D.C.L., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford.

15. At Lechlade, aged 68, William J. Cole, K.H., R.N. This gallant officer entered the navy in 1802, and seems to have been incessantly engaged in boat actions, and cuttings out on the French coast. He served at the sieges of Maldonado and Monte Video, and in all parts of the world. He was first-lieutenant of the *Royal Sovereign*, when the yacht of the Duke of Clarence (William IV.), as Lord High Admiral. Mr. Cole was nominated a K.H. in 1837, and attained post-rank in 1838, since which he has not been employed. After so many desperate encounters and so much active service, the gallant officer settled down quietly in the town of Lechlade, where he passed the remainder of his days in the exercise of peaceful virtues and exemplary benevolence.

— At Sidmouth, Katherine Pyndar, Lady Sherbrooke, of Calverton Hall, Notts, widow of the late Sir John Coope Sherbrooke, G.C.B., for many years Governor-

DEATHS—MAY.

General of Upper and Lower Canada, and Colonel of the 33rd Regiment.

16. At Grahamstown, Cape of Good Hope, South Africa, aged 40, John Armstrong, D.D., first Anglican Bishop of Grahamstown. Dr. Armstrong was the son of an eminent London physician, who, like himself, was cut off at an early age and in the midst of a career of honour and usefulness. He was educated at the Charterhouse School, and afterwards at Lincoln College, Oxford; his name being found in the third class Lit. Hum. at the B.A. degree, 1836. After leaving the University, and receiving holy orders, the future Bishop was for some time a curate in the diocese of Salisbury, and afterwards a priest-vicar of the Cathedral and Rector of St. Paul's, Exeter, where he won golden opinions for the zealous and faithful character of his ministrations -- interesting himself more especially in the cause of church penitentiaries for our fallen women. He became afterwards Rector of Tidenham on the Wye, in which delightful retreat he had leisure to gratify the more favourite pursuit of literature. Here he wrote several valuable series of tracts—"The Tracts for the Christian Seasons," "Sermons for Christian Seasons," &c., besides contributing to the Reviews. When Bishop Grey, of Cape Town, was in England, effecting a division of his very extensive diocese, Dr. Armstrong was chosen as the first missionary Bishop of Grahams-town, hitherto a district of the diocese of Cape Town. The new Bishop was consecrated on St. Andrew's day, 1853, conjointly with Dr. Colenso, Bishop of Natal. After a short but active episcopate of hardly two years, Bishop Armstrong was suddenly called away, and died at the episcopal residence on the 16th of May. The Bishop had suffered from ill-health soon after his consecration, and the heavy requirements of a colonial diocese doubtless hastened his end. Nothing could exceed the sympathy and sorrow of all classes throughout the diocese upon the occasion of his death. He was honoured by a public funeral—business was suspended, and the whole town was in mourning. He was buried in the Church of England cemetery, and the colony is now erecting a memorial chapel over his remains, in testimony of the incalculable good effected by his instrumentality, during the brief period in which he ruled the infant diocese of which he was the first Bishop. Though not of the popular party in the Church, the late Bishop Armstrong was a man of large and

comprehensive views, and won respect and admiration from all. While in England he published two volumes of excellent sermons. He has left a widow and four children.

17. While on a visit at Newburgh Park, the seat of Sir George Wombwell, in Yorkshire, the Right Hon. Adolphus Fitzclarence, Rear-Admiral of the White, aged 54. The deceased, the second son of his late Majesty King William IV., by the celebrated actress Mrs. Jordan, was born Feb. 18, 1802, and was the last survivor of the four brothers. He entered the navy May 26, 1814, as first-class volunteer on board the *Impregnable*, 98, Captains Blackwood and Adam, bearing the flag of H.R.H. the Duke of Clarence, in which ship he shortly after escorted the allied sovereigns from Calais to Dover. He then, as midshipman, joined the *Newcastle*, 50, Captain Lord George Stuart, on the North American station, and on his return in 1815 proceeded to the Mediterranean in the *Tagus*, from which he was transferred first to the *Rockford*, and then to the *Glasgow*, till he received his first commission, bearing date April 23, 1821. He served as lieutenant in the *Euryalus*, 42, till he attained the rank of Commander in 1823, and obtained the command of the *Brisk* sloop, on the North-Sea station. In 1824 he was made post-captain, and Feb. 9, 1826, appointed to the *Ariadne*, 26, in the Mediterranean; July 2, 1827, to the *Challenger*, 28, in which vessel he brought home the Governor-General of Canada, Lord Dalhousie, from Quebec to England. Subsequently, in the *Pallas*, 42, he was employed in conveying Lord Dalhousie and the Bishop of Calcutta from Portsmouth to Bengal, and Lord Combermere from India, home. When his father, William IV., ascended the throne, the command of the *Royal George* yacht was given to him. He was also made Groom of the Robes to the King, with the rank of Groom of the Bedchamber, and shortly after he was advanced, with the other children of Mrs. Jordan, to the rank of a marquis's younger son. In January, 1833, he was made a Lord of the Bedchamber, and was also Deputy Ranger of Bushey and Windsor Home Parks. By Her Majesty the command of the royal yacht *Victoria and Albert* was conferred upon him, and this he continued to hold till he attained the rank of Rear-Admiral. In 1832 King William IV. presented a very beautiful miniature frigate to the King of Prussia, who on that occasion created Lord Adol-

plus a Knight of the Red Eagle of Prussia, first class, for conveying the vessel. Twenty years later he was nominated a Grand Cross of the Royal Hanoverian Guelphic order.

17. At Leamington, aged 74, Sir Frederick Gustavus Fowke, bart., of Lowesby, in the county of Leicester. He was born on Jan. 24, 1782, the third, but eldest surviving son, of Sir — Fowke, knt., Groom of the Bedchamber to his Royal Highness Frederick, Duke of Cumberland (the brother of George III.). This circumstance introduced him to Court life from his earliest years, and he appears to have been admirably adapted to the gay society in which he moved. He was created a baronet, which dignity had been formerly possessed by two branches of his maternal ancestry.

— At Walhampton, Lymington, Hampshire, aged 87, the Rev. Sir George Burrard, the third Baronet (1769), Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty, Rector of Burton Coggles, Lincolnshire, and Vicar of Middleton Tyas, Yorkshire. Sir George succeeded to the baronetcy in 1840, on the death of his brother, Admiral Sir Harry Burrard Neale, G. C. B. and G. C. M. G., the dignity having been conferred on their uncle, Sir Harry Burrard, with remainder to his brothers William and George, and their male issue.

18. At his residence, Ilfracombe, Sir James Meek, knt., C. B., late Comptroller of the Victualling of Her Majesty's Navy, aged 77. Sir James had done much public service during the war as a commissariat officer; and as secretary to Lord Keith and other Admirals commanding in the Mediterranean. In 1830, he was appointed Comptroller of the Victualling of the Navy and Transport Services, and on his retirement from this post in 1850, was made a C. B., and knighted.

— At his residence on Clapham Common, aged 85, Benjamin Harrison, esq., father of the Ven. Archdeacon of Maidstone.

— Mr. James Wilson, of Woodville, younger brother of the late Professor Wilson. Mr. Wilson was a distinguished naturalist, and the author of two well-known works, "The Rod and the Gun," and "A Tour Round the North of Scotland."

19. At his house in Chesham Street, Belgrave Square, William Evans, esq., of Twynersh, Chertsey, late Sheriff of London and Middlesex.

— At Cheltenham, Georgina, wife of

Colonel Stirling Freeman Glover, and daughter of the late General the Right Hon. Charles Henry Somerset.

19. At Vienna, aged 73, Baron Sina, the banker, one of the largest landed proprietors, and one of the richest men, in that part of the world. The deceased is said to have left property to the enormous amount of 40,000,000*fl.* (4,000,000*l.*)

20. At her residence, 10, Hertford Street, Mayfair, Mrs. Dent, widow of the late John Dent, esq., M. P.

21. In Dublin, aged 65, Colonel Archibald Inglis, late of Carlingwark House, N. B., son of the late Admiral Inglis, of Red Hall, near Edinburgh.

22. At Newton Villa, Westbourne Grove, Colonel James Lewis Basden, C. B., formerly of the 89th Foot.

24. At Portisham, Dorset, aged 78, Augusta Sarah Masterman Hardy, last surviving sister of the late Admiral Sir Thomas Masterman Hardy, Bart., G. C. B.

25. Mary, only daughter of the late H. Brougham, esq., of Brougham, Westmoreland, and sister of the Right Hon. Lord Brougham.

26. At Ruyton Hall, Shropshire, aged 40, Helen Bird Harington, daughter of the late John Herbert Harington, esq., formerly Member of the Supreme Council of Bengal.

— At Blackheath, aged 81, John May, esq., the friend and correspondent of Robert Southey, who dedicated to him his poem on the "Battle of Waterloo."

— At Nea House, Christchurch, Hants, aged 65, Lieut.-Colonel William Gordon Cameron, K. H., J. P., eldest son of General Cameron, E. I. C. S. He served in the Grenadier Guards during the latter years of the Peninsular War, and was wounded at Barossa. Colonel Cameron was attached to the staff of Wellington at Waterloo. The loss of his right arm and other severe wounds in that memorable battle incapacitated him from further active service.

— At his residence, Sodylt Hall, Shropshire, aged 77, George Bennett, esq., Q. C., formerly a leading member of the Irish bar.

27. At Southsea, after a short illness, the Hon. Mrs. Hope, wife of Captain James Hope, C. B., and daughter of Charles Lord Kinnaird.

29. At Folkestone, aged 79, General John Francis Birch, C. B., Royal Engineers.

30. At St. Leonard's-on-Sea, Ann Helen, widow of the late Major George Cuninghame, Bengal Army, and eldest daughter

DEATHS.—JUNE.

of the late Major-General Sir Joseph O'Halloran, G.C.B.

31. At his residence, 17, Soho Square, aged 50, in consequence of a fall from his house, Daniel Sharpe, esq., F.R. and L.S., and President of the Geological Society.

— At Aix-la-Chapelle, Lieut.-General Macdonald, Royal Artillery, C.B. The deceased was present at the capture of the Cape of Good Hope, in 1806, and proceeded thence on the expedition to Buenos Ayres, where he was twice severely wounded and taken prisoner. He served in the Peninsula and south of France from June, 1809, to July, 1814, including the battles of the Coa and Busaco, affairs of Redinha, Pombal, Condeixa, and Foz d'Aronee, battles of Fuentes d'Onor and Salamanca, affair of San Munos, battle of Vittoria, siege of San Sebastian, battles of the Pyrenees, affairs of the Gave d'Oleron and Aire, and battle of Toulouse. He also served in the campaign of 1815, including the battle of Waterloo, where he was severely wounded, and the capture of Paris. He received the silver war medal with eight clasps.

JUNE.

4. At Paris, aged 61, the Right Hon. Maria Theresa, Countess of Shrewsbury and Waterford. Her ladyship was the eldest daughter of William Talbot, esq., of Castle Talbot, in the county of Wexford. She was married at Bath, in 1814, to John Talbot, esq., who became 17th Earl of Shrewsbury on the demise of his uncle Charles, the 16th Earl, in 1827. His lordship died at Naples suddenly in 1852. By this marriage her ladyship had issue, a son, who died in infancy, and two daughters, Maria Alatheia Beatrix, created a Princess by the King of Bavaria, married to Prince Doria Pamphilj Laudi, and has issue, one son and four daughters; and Catherine Gwendaline married Mark Antony, Prince de Borghese, who died in Italy, in 1840, leaving an only daughter, now the wife of Rodolph, Prince de Piombino, Duke of Sora.

— At his residence, the Grove, near Sevenoaks, aged 93, Sir Alexander Crichton. Sir Alexander was for many years physician in ordinary to Alexander I., Emperor of Russia, and also physician to the household of the late Duke of Cambridge. He was one of the oldest, if not the oldest, Fellows of the Royal Society, having been elected in 1800. He was a member of various other British and Foreign learned societies, and was a Knight of one

Prussian and two Russian orders. He was created a Knight Bachelor in 1820.

4. At Lee Hall, near Hexham, aged 72, Sir Molyneux Hyde Nepean, second Baronet, of Bothenhampton, and Lodgers Court, in the county of Dorset, eldest son of the first Baronet, the Right Hon. Sir Evan Nepean, many years Under Secretary of State, and M.P. for Queensborough and Bridport.

— At Hampton near Bath, George Townsend Browne, esq., youngest son of the late Right Hon. Col. Arthur Browne, and grandson of the first Earl of Altamont.

— At his house, Eaton Square, Richard Gardner, esq., M.P. for Leicester.

— At her residence, Seamore Place, May Fair, the Right Hon. Lady Agnes Buller.

— Aged 90, William Wilmot, esq., youngest son of Sir Robert Wilmot, 1st Baronet, of Osmaston, in the county of Derby.

5. At Paris, aged 70, Samuel Gurney, of Upton, Essex. Mr. Gurney was head of the greathouse of Overend, Gurney and Co.

6. At the Palace, Stapleton, near Bristol, aged 72, the Right Rev. James Henry Monk, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

The late Bishop was the only son of an officer in the army, and was educated at the Charterhouse, and thence went to Trinity College, Cambridge, in October, 1800. In the following year he was elected scholar, and after gaining several college prizes, came out seventh wrangler. In the same year he was second Chancellor's medallist. On the 1st of October, 1805, Mr. Monk was elected to a fellowship at Trinity. In October, 1807, he became assistant tutor of the college, and commenced his classical lectures, and such was the effect produced on the minds of his pupils, that during the fifteen years of his tutorship, they carried off the greater part of the higher classical honours at Cambridge. In November, 1808, Professor Porson died suddenly in London, and so high stood the opinion of Mr. Monk's scholarship, that although only 25, he was elected to succeed him in the Professorship of Greek.

In 1811, the new Professor of Greek, following the footsteps of his celebrated predecessor, published an edition of the *Hippolytus* of Euripides. This work was received with favour by the scholars of the day, and though not thought to be marked by the deep erudition of Porson, went through several editions, and is still in repute.

To the *Hippolytus* succeeded, in 1816,
S

the *Alcestis* of Euripides, of which the fifth and last edition appeared in 1837.

This work obtained considerable reputation both at home and on the Continent, where it has been reprinted. While this was in progress, Dr. Monk, in conjunction with Bishop Blomfield, published the *Ricardi Porsoni Adversaria*, and a periodical devoted to classical learning, entitled *Museum Criticum*, or Cambridge Classical Researches, to which all the most learned men of the day were contributors.

It was probably in recognition of his acknowledged merits as a scholar, that in 1822, Lord Liverpool, at that time Premier, bestowed on Dr. Monk the deanery of Peterborough, vacated by the death of Dr. Kipling. In the same year he resigned his professorship, and vacated his fellowship by marrying Jane, only daughter of the Rev. H. Hughes, of Nuneaton. In right of his deanery, he nominated himself to the rectory of Fiskerton, Lincolnshire. Here he spent his leisure time in beautifying the cathedral of Peterborough, which suffered more than its share of injury in the civil wars, when it was turned into a rope walk. For this purpose he contributed liberally himself, and collected the sum of 6000*l.* In 1830 a canonry at Westminster was added to Dr. Monk's other preferments, and in the same year, the late Duke of Wellington recommended him for promotion to the see of Gloucester, then vacant by the translation of Dr. Bethell to the see of Bangor; and, accordingly, he was consecrated at Lambeth on the 11th of July in that year. In the year 1836, the see of Ely falling vacant, the Government of Lord Melbourne translated Dr. Allen thither from Bristol, in order to carry into effect a double purpose—the amalgamation of the latter see with Gloucester, in accordance with the recommendation of the Ecclesiastical Commission (of which Bishop Monk was an original member), and the creation of a new bishopric at Ripon.

It was during the period he held the deanery of Peterborough, that he published the “*Life of Bentley*,” in 2 vols. 4to. a very valuable contribution to our literature. Subsequently, the Bishop is supposed, on sufficient grounds, to have continued his editorial labours in Euripides, by the publication of editions of the *Iphigenia in Aulis*, and the *Tauris*, which were published anonymously in 1840 and 1845. As a Lord of Parliament, the Bishop took no very prominent part in the discussions in the House; for, although a very clear-

headed thinker, his lordship was a very indifferent orator. As a bishop of the Church, he was also very cautious and moderate. He was, beyond question, a sound Churchman, somewhat inclined to the High-Church party; yet he was much opposed to the Tractarian movement, and signed the protest against the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the see of Hereford.

As an administrator of the affairs of his diocese, he was much beloved, and his gentle and moderate views caused him to be much revered by all parties.

He was very charitable, and not only promoted, but assisted the erection of churches, schools, and parsonages, wherever they were wanted.

By his wife, who survives him, his lordship has left three daughters and an only son, who graduated some years since at Trinity College, Cambridge, and has published a volume of travels in Turkey and the East, under the title of “*The Golden Horn*.”

6. At Berne, Louisa Georgina, lady of Sir J. William Hort, of Hortland House, county of Kildare, bart., and daughter of the late Sir John Caldwell, bart., of Castle Caldwell, county of Fermanagh.

7. At High Beech, Essex, aged 78, Mary, widow of the late Mr. Serjeant Arabin, and sister of the late Sir Henry Meux, bart.

— At Hanover, aged 83, Sir Julius Hartman, K.C.B., well known in England for his distinguished services in the King's German Legion in the Peninsular War, and his intimate friendship with the late Duke of Wellington. Only a few days before his death, the General was created a baron of the kingdom of Hanover, as a special mark of distinction conferred by the King, it being, moreover, the only time this honour has been granted during the present reign.

8. At Bury St. Edmunds, aged 68, Francis King Eagle, esq., Benchet of the Middle Temple, justice of the peace for the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, and Judge of the County Courts of Suffolk.

9. At Brighton, aged 68, Thomas Barrett Lennard, esq., eldest son of Sir Thomas Barrett Lennard, bart., of Belhus, Essex. In 1820 Mr. Lennard became a candidate for Ipswich in the Liberal interest, and though not successful at the poll, he subsequently unseated Mr. John Round on petition. In 1826 he was elected for Maldon, and continued to represent that borough down to 1837, when he was ejected by his

old opponent, Mr. John Round; he was again unsuccessful at the general election of 1841; he regained his seat, however, in 1847. At the election of 1852 he was again unsuccessful. Mr. Lennard was looked upon as one of the chief supporters of the liberal cause in the county of Essex, the southern division of which his father represented in the first reformed Parliament: but being of retired and studious habits, he took little part in the active business of a magistrate for the county. His only son, Thomas Barrett, is now heir-apparent to the baronetcy.

10. At Cadogan Place, Belgrave Square, aged 70, Elizabeth, second and only surviving sister of the late Sir William Whymper, and granddaughter of Thurston Whymper, esq., formerly of Alderton Hall, Suffolk.

— At Temple Hill, East Budleigh, Devon, aged 77, General Sir George Pownall Adams, K.C.H., Colonel of the 6th Enniskillen Dragoons. He entered the army in 1795, and having shown considerable ability in the Irish Rebellion of 1803, obtained the command of the 25th Light Dragoons in the East Indies. He served in India under General Lake, and particularly distinguished himself at Mysore in 1809; he also received the thanks of the Governor-General in Council on more than one occasion.

— At 75, Eccleston Square, Alicia, wife of Sir Fortunatus Dwaris.

— Aged 71, Mary, relict of John Legh, esq., of High Legh, Chester.

11. At Newton St. Cryes, near Exeter, Lieut.-Colonel John Allen Ridgway, who served in the 95th Foot (Rifle Brigade) during the Peninsular War, and at Waterloo.

— At Berlin, aged 76, Professor Friedrich Heinrich Von der Hagen, the well-known editor of the *Minnesinger*, the *Nibelungenlied*, the *Heldenbuck*, and other works relating to the study of old German literature.

12. At Penrose, near Helston, the Rev. John Rogers, M.A., Canon-Residentary of Exeter Cathedral, aged 77.

— At Swainston, Isle of Wight, the seat of Sir John Simeon, bart., aged 30, Edmund Rodney Pollexfen Bastard, esq., of Killey, Devon.

— At Cheltenham, aged 67, Rear-Admiral Thomas Prickett.

13. At Woolwich, aged 76, Lieut-General Thomas Paterson, Colonel-Commandant of the 5th Battalion Royal Artillery.

— At the residence of his mother, in Gloucester Road, Pimlico, Henry Lang-

horne Thompson, one of the gallant defenders of Kars.

Captain Thompson was the son of a gentleman who held the appointment of Receiver-General for Crown Rents for the northern counties, was educated at Eton, and in 1845 entered the military profession, of which he became so early an ornament. He was appointed to an ensigncy in the 68th Regiment of Bengal Native Infantry in that year. On February 12th, 1850, he was promoted to a lieutenancy, and in the second Burmese war received a wound from which he had not recovered when he returned to England, after nearly ten years' service, in the autumn of 1854. When the demand was felt for Indian officers to aid in the proposed campaign in Asia against the Russians, Lieutenant Thompson, his wounded arm still in a sling, volunteered, and after visiting the seat of war in the Crimea, returned to Constantinople, and proceeded to Erzeroum and Kars. In consequence of his gallant behaviour at Kars, he was appointed, in the winter of last year, a captain (unattached) of the royal army, and it recently pleased Her Majesty to confer on him, and on his gallant comrades, the dignity of a Companion of the Bath.

His conduct under the command of General Sir William F. Williams is matter for history, and must command the eulogies which even history is slow to pronounce on those not holding high command. It is perhaps fortunate for the memory of this brave young officer, cut off in his early prime—for he had only reached his 27th year—that he was one of “a small band of heroes.” His name will be ever associated with those of Williams and Lake, and Teesdale and Sandwith, and other gallant men. On the memorable 29th of Sept., he succeeded, with great tact and energy, in getting a heavy gun into position on the heights of Karadagh, and materially assisted in winning that victory, by the deadly fire which he poured into the Russian ranks.

On the surrender of Kars, Mouravieff generously returned him his sword, in admiration of his noble and devoted courage, and as a mark of honour and respect. This will doubtless be preserved as a precious heirloom.

Captain Thompson reached Hull only on the 7th inst., in company with Colonel Lake, amid the cheers of its citizens. He was then suffering from sore throat, but no fears were entertained till the day preceding his decease.

14. At Limegrove, Putney, aged 87, Lady St. Aubyn.

15. In Gloucester Gardens, Hyde Park, aged 78, Sir George Duckett, bart., a Deputy-Lieutenant for Hertfordshire, and M.P. for Lymington from 1807 to 1812, son of Sir George Jackson, bart., formerly Secretary to the Admiralty, and Judge-Advocate, and many years M.P. for Colchester and Weymouth. He assumed the name of Duckett in 1797, after his maternal grandfather, G. Duckett, esq., of Hartham House, Wilts. Sir George was formerly Colonel of the West Essex Militia.

18. At Kirouclitree, aged 79, Lady Heron Maxwell, of Heron.

21. At Boulogne-sur-Mer, aged 44, Lady Carmichael Anstruther, wife of Sir W. C. Anstruther, bart.

— At Goodnestone Park, Louisa, last surviving daughter of the late Sir Brook Bridges, bart.

— At the Palombier, near Tours, aged 81, Major-Gen. Thomas Peacocke, C.T.S.

— At Bradfield Cottage, aged 57, Charlotte Anne, widow of the Hon. and Rev. Arthur Philip Perceval.

22. At his residence, Birdholme, Derbyshire, aged 72, Sir James Hunloke, bart.

— In Westbourne Terrace, General Sir J. Wilson, K.C.B., K.T.S., Colonel of the 11th (North Devonshire) Regiment of Foot. The gallant general had seen much active service from the spring of 1794 up to the close of the war in 1815. He served in the West Indies in 1796, and was present at the capture of St. Lucie, including the siege of Morne Fortunée; also at the taking of St. Vincent, including the operations against the forts in that island. In July following he was made prisoner and carried into Guadaloupe. In January, 1797, he was captured again in the British Channel. In 1798 he was at the taking of Minorca. In 1800 he took part in the expedition against Cadiz, and in the following year proceeded with the army to Egypt, and was present in the actions of the 13th and 21st of March, and during the whole of that campaign. He proceeded to the Peninsula in 1808, and fought at the battle of Vimiera, where he was severely wounded. In January the succeeding year he joined the Lusitanian Legion, and acted with that corps during an arduous period of service, in which he was repeatedly engaged with the enemy, being employed in covering Ciudad Rodrigo and Almeida. He was attached to the Portuguese army in June, 1810, and during the subsequent operations against Marshal Soult, as well in the north of Portugal as on the eastern frontier, he commanded an advanced corps of Marshal

Beresford's army. In April, 1811, he was appointed second in command to General Silveira, in the province of Tras os Montes, and acted as such during a period of the operations against Puebla da Sanabria, when the place was taken by that general. In September following he was appointed to the command of the advanced guard of General Barcellar's *corps d'armée*, and employed on Marshal Massena's rear during his invasion of Portugal, being repeatedly engaged with the enemy. He took the field again in April, 1812, in command of the militia of the province of Minho, and was engaged in active operations against Marshal Marmont on the frontiers of the Beira. At his own request he, in June, 1813, joined the main army, and was appointed to the command of the First Portuguese Brigade of Infantry, with which he served at the siege of San Sebastian, the passage of the Bidassoa, and the battle of the Nivelle, and, on the 18th of November following, being engaged with his brigade, he was again severely wounded. He received the gold war medal for his services at the assault and capture of San Sebastian, and the silver medal and two clasps for Vimiera and Nivelle. He was also for his services rewarded with the knighthood of the Order of St. Bento d'Avis, and made a Knight Commander of the Tower and Sword, and was in 1837 made a Knight Commander of the Order of the Bath. He for some years commanded the forces in Ceylon, and in May, 1841, the colonelcy of the 11th Regiment of Foot was given to him by the Duke of Wellington.

23. Suddenly, aged 69, Lydia Elizabeth, wife of Sir Thomas Dyke Acland, bart., M.P., of Killerton, Devonshire.

26. At his house in Union Street, Southwark, aged 82, George Gwilt, esq., F.S.A. Mr. Gwilt was the elder of two sons of Mr. George Gwilt, an architect and surveyor, also of St. Saviour's, Southwark, the younger son being Mr. Joseph Gwilt, the author of "the Encyclopædia of Architecture," and other important works.

Mr. George Gwilt was brought up to his father's profession of an architect, and succeeded to his professional practice on his death. His chief work, and that with which his name will always be worthily associated, was the restoration of the choir and tower of St. Mary Overy's Church, though at an enormous expense; and when, by the exertions of a few enthusiasts, the lady-chapel was rescued from destruction, and its restoration effected by means of a public subscription exceeding 3000*l.*,

DEATHS.—JULY.

Mr. Gwilt liberally undertook the professional direction and superintendence of the work, and performed it gratuitously.

Mr. Gwilt was engaged in many of the most remarkable reparations and restorations of the public buildings of the metropolis.

Mr. Gwilt was elected a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries on Dec. 14, 1815.

26. At Castle Comer, co. Kilkenny, John Butler Clarke Southwell Wandesforde, esq., eldest son of the Hon. C. H. B. C. S. Wandesforde, of Castle Comer, Ireland, and Kirklington Hall, Yorkshire.

27. At the Hermitage, Snaresbrook, aged 82, Sir Jas. Wm. Morrison, late deputy-master of Her Majesty's Mint.

Lately. In France, aged 84, General Baron Petit; he fought as a volunteer in 1792, and received the celebrated *adieux* of the Emperor Napoleon to his Old Guard at Fontainebleau.

Lately. Aged 83, Mrs. L. B. Wilson, Clapham Common, leaving 15,000*l.* to the British and Foreign Bible Society.

JULY.

1. At Cologne, the Hon. Mrs. J. J. Whaites, youngest daughter of the late Lord Wodehouse.

2. At Dover Street, London, the Countess of St. Germans. The deceased was third daughter of Charles, second Marquis of Cornwallis, by Lady Louisa, fourth daughter of Alexander, fourth Duke of Gordon.

3. At Brighton, Mary Anna, wife of Sir Charles Mansfield Clarke, bart.

4. At Brighton, General Sir Jeffery Prendergast, Madras Army.

5. Aged 67, the Hon. and Rev. James Somers Cocks, B.A., 1809, M.A., 1814, Brasenose College, Oxford, Canon of Worcester (1830), and of Hereford (1824), heir presumptive to his nephew, the present Earl Somers.

— At Hampton Court Palace, Alicia, eldest daughter of the late E. C. Pottinger, esq., of Mount Pottinger, county of Down.

6. At the residence of General Forbes, at Stoke-by-Nayland, suddenly, aged 79, Mrs. Louisa Forbes, sister to the General.

9. At Monkwearmouth, aged 72, Lieut. Newton. He was stationed at one of the middle deck guns of the "Neptune," 98, at the battle of Trafalgar, and was also strokesman of the barge that bore the French Admiral a prisoner on board the "Victory."

9. At Llandaff, aged 65, Maria Eleanor Knight, relict of the late Dean of Llandaff, and daughter of the late Llewellyn Traherne, esq.

— At Brighton, Colonel the Hon. James Knox.

10. At Port Carlisle, drowned whilst bathing, two daughters of Mrs. Hinde, and one daughter of Mr. Caleb Hodgson, all of Carlisle.

— At Cocken Hall, aged 49, William Standish Standish, esq., of Cocken Hall, and Duxbury Park, Lancashire.

14. At Llandudno, near Carnarvon, aged 34, Johnson Bourne, esq., Captain 1st Derby Militia. Serving in the 41st Foot, he was in the Crimean campaign, and was present at the battles of the Alma and Inkermann, and the repulse of the great sortie from Sebastopol on the 26th of October. He was invalided home in the spring of 1855, when, the state of his health being such as not to admit of his again returning to the Crimea, he retired from the service. When sufficiently convalescent he took a commission in the 1st Derby Militia.

16. At Richmond, Miss Hannah Penn, great granddaughter of the celebrated William Penn.

17. At Evington, near Cheltenham, Lady Brook Faulkner.

18. At Taverham, Norfolk, aged 51, Nathaniel Waldegrave John Branthwayt Micklethwait, esq., late Lieut.-Colonel of Scotch Fusilier Guards.

19. At Gravesend, aged 67, Colonel Charles Shee, second son of the late Sir George Shee, bart.

20. At Hafton House, Argyleshire, the Hon. Maria Corinna, wife of Captain C. Monteith Hamilton, 92nd Highlanders, and third daughter of Viscount Gort; and on the same day, in London, the Hon. Julia Georgina Vereker, youngest daughter of Viscount Gore.

21. At Chesterton, near Cambridge, David and Mary Ann Middleton, aged 81 and 83. The aged pair had been married 60 years, and had lived 44 years at Chesterton. From the proceeds of a small farm they had not only brought up a numerous family respectably, but were enabled to give scope to that kindly feeling which finds pleasure in relieving the wants of the distressed. Both expired within ten minutes of each other, and both were interred in one grave.

23. At Leamington, aged 68, the Hon. Georgiana Hornby, widow of the Rev. Geoffrey Hornby, Rector of Bury, Lancashire.

23. At Lythwood Hall, Salop, aged 45, Maria Leyland, wife of the Rev. R. Hornby, and youngest daughter of the late Sir Wm. Feilden, bart., of Feniscowles, Lancashire.

— At Tayles Hill, Ewell, Surrey, aged 57, Frederic Millet, esq., late member of the Supreme Council of India.

25. In the Pontifical States, aged 65, Christopher Fitzsimon, esq. The deceased was son-in-law of the late Daniel O'Connell, with whom he was united in political action for a long series of years. From 1832 to 1840 he represented his native county of Dublin in Parliament, when he retired on his appointment to the Hanaper Office.

26. In Hill Street, Berkeley Square, aged 72, the Hon. Lucy Cust, second surviving daughter of the first Lord Brownlow.

27. At her house, in Southampton, aged 87, Mrs. J. Purvis, widow of the late Vice-Admiral Purvis, and daughter of the late Admiral Sir Archibald Dickson, bart.

27. At Fawsley Park, Northamptonshire, aged 75, Selina Mary, Lady Knightley, relict of Sir Charles Knightley, bart., and daughter of Felton Lionel Hervey, esq.

30. At Hornby Castle, near Catterick, aged 81, the Duchess Dowager of Leeds.

— At Lyme Regis, aged 78, Monique, widow of Alan Bellingham, esq., of Castle Bellingham, county of Louth.

31. At Horsendon House, Bucks, the residence of his son-in-law, aged 70, Thos. Oliver Anderson, esq., one of Her Majesty's Counsel and Bencher of Lincoln's Inn.

AUGUST.

1. At Bonn, aged 60, Sir Robert Innes Grant, bart., of Dalvey.

3. At Roehampton Estate, St. James's, Jamaica, aged 59, the Hon. Isaac Jackson, one of the largest and most successful proprietors and cultivators of that island. Mr. Jackson was Lieut.-Colonel of the Western Interior Regiment of Militia; and on the promulgation of the new constitution was nominated by the Crown a member of the Legislative Council—a post of honour in which he pre-eminently distinguished himself, not less by the unostentatious simplicity than by the inflexible independence of his character.

5. At his residence, Wartensee Castle, on the Lake Constance, Switzerland, Robert Lucas Pearsall, esq. This gentleman, who was originally destined for the bar, being of a competent fortune and great

taste in music, chose rather to indulge the taste in which his happiness lay than to drudge in a pursuit for which he had no liking. Having settled in the neighbourhood of Bristol, he there cultivated his beautiful art with great success; and, besides being a member of the musical societies of that city, he composed many beautiful madrigals—a species of composition in which he had great delight. Having casually paid a visit to Carlsruhe, Mr. Pearsall was so much delighted with the amenities of that city, and the musical coteries to be met there, that he took up his permanent residence there; and having purchased the ancient castle of the Counts of Wartensee on Lake Constance, he repaired it, fitted it up, and made it his future abode. In this historic retreat he passed the remainder of his life in the study of music and archæology, and in the exercise of an elegant hospitality.

5. At her residence, in Clarence Terrace, the Right Hon. Lady Ravensworth, eldest daughter of Lord George Seymour, youngest son of the first Marquis of Hertford, and sister of Sir Hamilton Seymour, G.C.H., and the Countess of Shannon.

— At North Brink, Wisbeach, aged 69, Robert Francis Pate, esq., formerly High Sheriff of the counties of Cambridge and Huntingdon.

8. At Grove Lodge, Fulham, aged 59, Lucia Elizabeth, wife of Mr. Chas. Matthews, comedian, daughter of the celebrated engraver, Francesco Bartolozzi—better known as Madame Vestris.

Mrs. Matthews was born in the year 1797, and from the first gave evidence of extraordinary abilities as a musician and a linguist. At the age of sixteen she was married to M. Armand Vestris, the principal dancer at and ballet-master of the then King's Theatre, in the Haymarket, at whose solicitation she entered upon the dramatic profession, appearing first as *Proserpina* in the opera of *Il Ratto di Proserpina*, at the theatre to which her husband was attached. Having, however, scarcely made the sensation which was expected, she did not remain in London, but accompanied her husband to Paris, where she played for some time in drama and tragedy in the French language, of which she was a perfect mistress. On her return to England in 1819, she accepted an engagement with Mr. Elliston, at Drury Lane, and Mozart's opera of *Don Giovanni* being at that time at the height of its popularity, she shortly afterwards established her fame in a burlesque of that master-

DEATHS.—Aug.

piece, called "Giovanni in London," in which she as the hero, and Harley as Leporello, created an extraordinary sensation. From this time her success was complete, and she reigned the spoilt favourite of the London public both at Drury Lane and Covent Garden, playing what is technically termed "first light comedy," such as Lydia Languish in "The Rivals," Letitia Hardy, in "The Belle's Stratagem," Miss Hardcastle in "She Stoops to Conquer," &c. Characters of more serious interest she never attempted. In the year 1829 she became lessee of the Olympic Theatre, which she transformed into the most elegant "temple of the drama" in London. Assisted by an admirable company, and having at her command the freshest and smartest dramatic authors then on town, her theatre soon became the most popular in the metropolis. There were first produced those brilliant extravaganzas and *revues* of Messrs. Planché and Charles Dance which commenced a new and elegant form of the drama. On the 7th Dec., 1835, Mr. Charles Matthews, who had been brought up as an architect, made his first appearance on the stage at the Olympic, in a farce called the "Old and Young Stager," in which he was admirably supported by Liston, at that time the prop of the establishment. In the year 1838, Madame Vestris, whose husband had died in 1825, married Mr. Charles Matthews. Soon afterwards they started for America. With our transatlantic neighbours, however, the favourites of the Olympic were a failure, and they returned to England in 1839, in the September of which year they entered upon the lease of Covent Garden. Under their management were produced some of the *chefs-d'œuvre* of modern dramatic authorship, among which may be mentioned "London Assurance," "Time Works Wonders," "Old Heads and Young Hearts," and some excellent pantomimes, "The Castle of Otranto," "The Great Bed of Ware," &c., and some of Mr. Planché's best burlesques.

After this they accepted a short engagement at Drury Lane with Mr. Macready, and a more lengthened one with Mr. Webster, at the Haymarket. In 1846, Mr. and Mrs. Matthews joined Mr. Maddox's company at the Princess's, and in the autumn of 1847, they opened the English Opera House in Wellington Street, under the name of the Lyceum. Here the old Olympic revels were renewed, several of the former actors and authors attached to the management flocking to the newly-

raised standard. Madame Vestris played two or three important parts, such as "The Wonderful Woman," and the "Pride of the Market," and made a great hit in more pathetic characters, as, for instance, in Mr. Slingsby Lawrence's "Chain of Events," and in the translation of Madame de Girardin's play *La Joie fait Peur*, under the name of "Sunshine through the Clouds." But her strength now began to fail her, and she principally confined herself to the direction of the stage, in which she showed the same elegant and finished taste which had made her management of the Olympic so remarkable. For the occasion of her husband's benefit, on Wednesday, the 26th of July, 1854, she made her last appearance in "Sunshine through the Clouds." Renowned during her youth for her beauty and *esprit*, and during the latter years of her life for her admirable taste and knowledge of everything appertaining to dramatic effect, few women have had their names brought so prominently before the world. It is useless to deny that many of the tales in circulation are not to the credit of the deceased actress; but during all her misfortunes, and notwithstanding many failures, Madame Vestris invariably maintained such undisturbable good-humour, and was known to be so generous and kind-hearted, that she never ceased to be a favourite with the public. Madame Vestris had not only a talent for dramatic representation, that is to say, for acting a character, but she possessed that much rarer qualification—the power of harmonising dramatic effect with the realities of every-day life. During her management, and under her artistic eye, were for the first time produced comedies of modern life, in which the dress and behaviour of the characters, and the adjuncts and accessories of the scene were such as the audience were rarely accustomed to see, and which equalled, and not unfrequently surpassed, the appropriate elegance of the French stage.

8. At Boulogne-sur-Mer, Lucy, widow of Lieut.-Colonel Sir William Young, bart., of Bailieborough Castle, co. Cavan.

— At her residence, Anstey Manor House, Hants, aged 81, Elizabeth Mary Miller, daughter of the late and sister of the present Sir Thomas Miller, bart., of Froyle, near Alton, Hants.

— At his residence, St. Mary's Square, Lambeth, aged 82, Lieut.-General Philips Hay.

9. After a few days' illness from para-

lysis, aged 77, Rear-Admiral Henry Fanshawe, of Tilbuster Lodge, Godstone.

9. Aged 43, Henry Philip Cholmeley, esq., of Brandsby Hall, Yorkshire.

— In the Lower Ward, Windsor Castle, Sir John Milley Doyle, K.C.B., aged 75.

Sir John entered the army as cornet in 1794, and served in the Egyptian campaign of 1801, under the illustrious Abercrombie. He was present at the various actions of the 8th, 13th, and 21st of March, the capture of Grand Cairo and Alexandria, and the other operations of that campaign. He afterwards served in the Peninsula from February, 1809, to the end of the war in 1814—first in command of a regiment, and subsequently of a brigade under the Duke of Wellington; he was present at the action of Grijon, passage of the Douro, Fuentes d'Onor, first siege of Badajoz, siege and assault of Ciudad Rodrigo, the battles of Vittoria, the Pyrenees, Nivelles, and others.

Sir John received a medal for his services in Egypt, and a cross and one clasp for Fuentes d'Onor, Ciudad Rodrigo, Vittoria, the Pyrenees, and others, and was made a Knight Commander of the Bath on the 2nd of January, 1815. He also received a great number of Orders from the Sovereigns whose cause had been served by the English army.

Sir John took service with the King of Portugal, where his exploits were so well known, and in the political convulsions which ensued in that country rendered great services to the king, John VI.

In 1831-2, Sir John was returned to Parliament for the county of Carlow. While still in Parliament, in 1832, Sir John was requested by his late Majesty Don Pedro to join the liberating army at Oporto; Sir John consented, and was immediately afterwards gazetted a Major-General in the Portuguese service, and aide-de-camp to his Imperial Majesty. The war, as is well known, lasted for two years, and was signalised by many gallant actions—the defence of Oporto and the capture of Lisbon in 1834. The English allies of the Constitutionalists now experienced that ingratitude which is proverbial to liberators, and seems natural to the Spanish Peninsula. Sir John and his companions were cheated of their rewards, insulted, imprisoned, and persecuted. Their case was frequently brought before Parliament; but nothing could be done, and Sir John, with vast sums due to him, and possessed of high nominal rank, was reduced to much distress, and never received redress.

Sir John was appointed a Military Knight of Windsor in July, 1853, and shortly afterwards received an appointment as Serjeant-at-Arms to Her Majesty.

10. At Lisbon, aged 23, Bertram Arthur Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury in England, Earl of Waterford and Wexford in Ireland. His Lordship was the only son of the late Lient.-Colonel Charles Thomas Talbot, nephew of Charles, the fifteenth Earl, and was born December 11, 1832. He was educated almost entirely by private tutors, under the roof of Alton Towers, by the late Earl and Countess, to whom he was devotedly attached. He was Premier Earl in the English and Irish peerages, Vice-Admiral of Cheshire, a Deputy-Lieutenant for Staffordshire, and High Steward of Allbrighton in the same county; he also held the honorary distinctions of a Knight Commander of Malta, and a Knight Grand Cross of the Order of Pope Pius IX. Lord Shrewsbury also claimed the office of Hereditary Lord High Steward of Ireland, and his claim was under the consideration of the House of Lords.

Since the death of the last Duke of Shrewsbury, in 1717, it is not a little singular that the earldom has never passed directly from a father to a son. The thirteenth Earl, being a priest, did not assume the title, which accordingly passed to the son of his brother George, as fourteenth Earl, and the last of his male descendants is now deceased.

Lord Shrewsbury was a person of singularly mild and gentle disposition, and of refined and elegant tastes; he was an accomplished scholar, especially in modern languages, of which his long residence upon the Continent had made him a perfect master. His charities were most extensive, and his death must prove a "heavy blow and great discouragement" to the prospects of the Roman Catholic religion in this country. He has left two sisters, both recently raised by Her Majesty to the precedence of the daughters of an Earl; the younger, Lady Gwendoline Talbot, is unmarried; the elder sister, Lady Annette, was married in January, 1855, to Sir Humphrey de Trafford, of Trafford Park, Lancashire. By the death of this Earl, the line in which the earldom has descended is extinct in the male line; and acting on the presumption that all the descendants in the male line of John Talbot, the celebrated warrior, are extinct—on whom, being possessors of the earldom, the estates are settled by Act of Parliament—the late Earl has devised all the family

DEATHS.—Aug.

estates to Lord Edmund Bernard Howard, the infant son of the present Duke of Norfolk, with remainder to his Grace's other younger sons, and to his brother, Lord Edward Howard, M.P., who is married to the late Earl's cousin, Miss Augusta Talbot. It is not, however, probable that the male line of the first Earl is extinct, and several claimants have appeared. Among them is Earl Talbot, whose claims are now before the House of Lords.

10. At Nairn, New Brunswick, aged 87, Lieut.-General W. A. Gordon, C.B., of Lochdhu, Colonel of Her Majesty's 54th Regiment. The deceased officer entered the service in 1794, served in Holland, and from 1810 to 1814 in the Peninsula, where he was wounded at Vittoria. He received a medal for the Nive, and the silver war medal for Fuentes d'Onoro and Vittoria.

— At Bath, Bertha, youngest daughter of the late David Ricardo, esq., M.P., of Gatcombe Park, Gloucestershire.

— At Highfield House, Notts, Alfred Lowe, esq., one of Her Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the county of Nottingham.

12. In Gloucester Place, Portman Square, aged 85, Jane, widow of Francis Canning, esq., of Foxcote, Warwickshire.

— At Norwood, Frances Elizabeth, second daughter of Sir Wm. Verner, bart., M.P.

— At Clifton, aged 87, Melasina Warburton Bayly, relict of Nathaniel Bayly, esq., of Bath. Mrs. Bayly was mother of the late popular poet, Thomas Haynes Bayly.

— At Boulogne-sur-Mer, of malignant sore throat, aged 2, George Ribton, youngest son—on the 19th, of the same disorder, Philip Cecil, aged 6, eldest and only surviving son—and, on the 18th, of the same disease, aged 39, Lavinia, the beloved wife—of Dr. Philip Crampton, of Avenue Marigny, Champs Elysées, Paris.

13. At Boulogne-sur-Mer, aged 10, Lady Mary Anne Nugent, daughter of the Marquis of Westmeath.

— At Harpenden, aged 90, John Wyatt, esq., Senior Bencher of the Inner Temple, and Attorney-General for North Wales.

14. At Clapham, aged 72, the Very Rev. William Buckland, D.D., Dean of Westminster, and Rector of Islip, Oxon. Dr. Buckland was born at Axminster, in Devon, in the year 1784. He received his early education at Winchester, and in 1801 obtained a scholarship in Corpus Christi College, Oxford. At this time Oxford was he most unpromising school in the world

for natural science. Nevertheless there were chairs of Botany, Chemistry, and Mineralogy, to indicate to the student that all human wisdom was not bound up in classics and mathematics. The tastes of young Buckland led him to the study of mineralogy, and in 1813 he was appointed to the Readership of Mineralogy, and in 1818 to the Readership of Geology. The interest he gave to these subjects attracted students, and his lectures may be considered the first instigators of that movement which has since so much enlarged the system of education at that university.

In 1820 Dr. Buckland delivered a lecture before the University of Oxford, which was afterwards published under the title of "*Vindiciæ Geologicæ; or, the Connection of Religion with Geology, explained.*" In this work he showed that there could be no opposition between the works and the Word of God, and that the influence of the study of natural science, so far from leading to atheism and irreligion, necessarily led to the recognition of God and to his worship. At this time, however, Dr. Buckland still adhered to the old hypothesis of the universality of the deluge. He, however, became convinced of the untenability of this position, and in his Bridgewater Treatise, published in 1836, entitled "Geology and Mineralogy considered with reference to Natural Theology," we find him adopting the views of Lyell and others.

Dr. Buckland's name will be ever associated in this country with his discoveries of the remains of animals in the caves of Kirkdale, and other parts of England. Of these discoveries he gave an account in the *Philosophical Transactions*. These discoveries and others served as a basis for a work published in 1823, entitled "*Reliquiæ Diluvianæ; or, Observations on the Organic Remains attesting the action of an universal deluge.*" Although the occurrence of these remains are now accounted for on a different theory, the great value of this work remains as a record of the first discovery of the remains of animals of which most have since disappeared from this part of the world, and thus revealing the nature of the animal inhabitants of Great Britain previous to the arrival of man.

His contributions to the *Proceedings of the Geological Society* were very numerous, and in the first volume of the *Bibliographia Geologicæ et Zoologicæ*, published by the Ray Society in 1848, we find references to sixty-one distinct works and

memoirs. Dr. Buckland's social habits often led him to work with others. Thus we find him early in his career working out the south-western coal district of Gayland in company with his friend Conybeare. In conjunction with the same distinguished geologist, he published "Sectional Views of the North-East Coast of Ireland," and "Illustrations of the Landslip on the Coast of Devonshire." With the late Sir H. de la Beche, he published a paper in the *Transactions of the Geological Society* "On the Geology of the Neighbourhood of Weymouth." In conjunction with the late Mr. Greenough, he published a paper on "Vitreous Tribes in Sand-hills, near Dirg, in Cumberland:" with Mr. Sykes, a paper on the interior of the dens of living hyænas. His papers generally display great powers of observation with unwearied industry; and many of the general conclusions arrived at by the author have now become part and parcel of the great laws of geological science. Dr. Buckland was one of the writers of the "Bridgewater Treatises," his volume being entitled "Geology and Mineralogy."

In 1825 Dr. Buckland accepted from his college the living of Stoke Charity, near Whitchurch, Hants; in the same year he was promoted to a Canonry in the Cathedral of Christ Church, and married Miss Mary Morland, of Abingdon. In 1818 he had been elected a Fellow of the Royal Society; and in 1829 he was chosen a member of the council of that body, and was re-elected on each successive occasion till his illness in 1849. In 1813 he became a Fellow of the Geological Society, and was twice elected President of that body. He took an active interest in the foundation of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, and was one of those who took the bold step of inviting this body to hold its second meeting in the University of Oxford. On this occasion he was President of the Association. From that time to 1848 he was constantly present at the meetings of the body, and read many of his papers before them.

In 1847 Dr. Buckland was appointed a Trustee of the British Museum, and took an active part in the development of that department more especially devoted to Geology and Palæontology. He also seconded to the utmost of his power the efforts of Sir Henry de la Beche to establish the Museum of Economic Geology, which is now, in conjunction with the Government Geological Survey, working so successfully in Jermyn Street as the School

of Mines. In 1845 Dr. Buckland received, at the hands of Sir Robert Peel, the Deanery of Westminster, vacated by the present Bishop of Oxford. This brought him to reside in London, where he immediately took a lively interest in all questions involving social amelioration. He exerted himself to gain a more free admission for the public to the monuments in Westminster Abbey; he joined the ranks of sanitary reformers, and brought his great knowledge of geology to bear on the questions of water supply, sewerage, and other health questions. Unhappily, for some years past, the world has been deprived of the labours of this diligent and practical philosopher, whose mental powers had become weakened.

14. At Torquay, the Hon. Arthur Schomberg Kerr, youngest son of the late Lord Martin Kerr and Charlotte, Countess of Antrim.

— At Valetta, Malta, aged 69, Miss Mary Thornton, only sister of Sir William Thornton, Auditor-General of Malta.

15. At Weston-super-Mare, aged 76, Carolina Marianna, widow of Richard Watt Walker, esq., of Michelgrove Park, Sussex.

17. Aged 81, William Hasledine Pepys, esq., F.R.S., of Earl's Terrace, Kensington, a well-known philosophical instrument-maker, of the Poultry, a Fellow of the Royal Society for nearly half a century, having been elected in 1808. He was chiefly distinguished for his chemical knowledge and acquirements, and was the author of various improvements in chemical apparatus.

— In London, aged 57, James Ham, esq., many years Mathematical Master of King's College School. He was author of several highly-reputed scientific works.

— In Upper Mount Street, Dublin, after a short illness, of diseased action of the heart, the result of excitement and fatigue during a protracted service in the trenches before Sebastopol, aged 28, Major de Moleyns, of the Royal Engineers.

18. At Ebury Street, Lucy Gilbert, daughter of the late Rev. Edmund Gilbert, of Windsor House, Bodmin, and sister of the late Lieut.-Gen. Sir Walter Raleigh Gilbert, bart.

— At the Vicarage, Halifax, aged 47, Ellen Frances, wife of the Venerable Archdeacon Musgrave.

21. At Glemham Hall, Suffolk, aged 81, the Hon. Sophia North, widow of Dudley North, esq.

— At Nonnenhorn, on the Lake of Constance, Herr Lindpaintner, the well-

known musical composer. He was buried with great honours at Stuttgardt, where he had filled for fifteen years the office of director to the grand opera.

21. At the Royal Hospital, Greenwich, aged 83, Peter Moser. This veteran sailor was in several engagements of the British navy between 1794 and 1806, including the battle of Trafalgar. When Nelson fell, Peter Moser served on board the Victory as captain of the main-top. In recognition of his services, which extended over more than twenty years, he received two medals, (one with three clasps,) and was for the last thirty years of his life an inmate of the above noble hospital.

— At his residence, the Quay, Great Yarmouth, aged 72, Charles Pearson, esq., Captain, R.N., and a magistrate of the borough.

24. At Blofield, near Norwich, aged 60, John James Onslow, esq., Captain R.N., the only surviving son of the late Admiral Sir Richard Onslow, bart., G.C.B.

30. At Windsor Castle, Lieut. Hugh Fleming, Military Knight of Windsor. Lieut. Fleming had seen much service, having served in the campaigns of Flanders in 1793, 1794, and 1795, in Holland in 1799, in Germany in 1805, at Copenhagen in 1807, in the Peninsula from 1809 to 1814. He was wounded in the actions of Bergen and Echalar, and at the siege of Valenciennes, and was taken prisoner at Placentia on the 2nd of August, 1809, but escaped ten days afterwards, and rejoined the army. He has received the war medal with eight clasps.

31. At Grafton Street, London, aged 59, Sophia, Lady Rendlesham.

— At Horton Place, Epsom, aged 77, John Trotter, esq., late M.P. for the county of Surrey. Mr. Trotter served in Spain as Commissary-General with Sir John Moore, and afterwards with the Duke of Wellington, as Storekeeper-General, in the short and glorious campaign which terminated the war.

SEPTEMBER.

1. In South Audley Street, aged 81, Sir Richard Westmacott, Professor of Sculpture in the Royal Academy. He was born in London in the year 1775. His father, who had received an university education at Brasenose College, Oxford, took to the business of a statuary, which he followed for some years in Mount Street, Grosvenor Square. It was in his father's studio that young Richard Westmacott imbibed the first ele-

ments of taste in sculpture; and having early shown signs of future distinction in this branch of art, he was sent to Rome in the year 1793. There he studied with Canova, and made such decided progress under the tuition of that master, that he obtained the first gold medal of the year for sculpture at the Academy of St. Luke. The subject was a *rilievo*, representing a scene in the history of "Joseph and his Brethren." This production of young Westmacott was still exhibited in Rome within the memory of many persons; but it has recently disappeared. He also obtained a first prize for sculpture at Florence, and was elected a member of the Academy there. Having returned to England in 1798, he married Dorothy Margaret, the daughter of Dr. Wilkinson. His first reputation in England was made about this period, upon the occasion of a design for some public work being thrown open to general competition. Westmacott's design was so remarkable as to induce the judges to issue a second and higher prize for studies of the same subject. From that period he steadily rose in estimation with the patrons of the arts, and was also employed in most of the important public works. Of the latter, the monuments to Sir Ralph Abercrombie and of Lord Duncan, in St. Paul's Cathedral, are of the earliest. St. Paul's Cathedral, indeed, from the number and variety of his productions, both monuments and *bassi rilievi*, may be consulted as a sort of gallery of the works of Sir Richard Westmacott. Among the statuary executed for private collections, some of the most celebrated and characteristic of his works are—"The Houseless Traveller," in the collection of the Marquis of Lansdowne; "Euphrosyne," executed for the late Marquis of Westminster; "The Dream of Horace," the two statues, "Cupid" and "Psyche," executed for the late Duke of Bedford; and a monument to the memory of Lord Penrhyn, at Penrhyn, in North Wales—a work less known to the public than the preceding. His monument to the memory of the Countess Rocksavage, where angels are represented as guardians of the departed spirit, is more generally known. He designed also the "Achilles" in Hyde Park; the statue of Lord Erskine, which stands in Lincoln's Inn Old Hall; that of Nelson, in the Liverpool Exchange; those of the Duke of Bedford and Charles James Fox, in Russell and Bloomsbury Squares; besides figures of Addison, Pitt, and many others. His last work of importance was the group of sculpture that occupies the pediment of the British Museum. At the

French Exposition three of his works were exhibited, and were much admired,—“A Nymph preparing for the Bath,” from the collection of the Earl of Carlisle; “The Houseless Wanderer,” above mentioned; and a “Sleeping Infant,” in the possession of the Countess of Dunmore. Sir R. Westmacott was elected an Associate of the Royal Academy in 1805, and a full member in 1816. In 1827 he succeeded Flaxman as lecturer to the Academy in Sculpture—an office which he held till his death. In 1837 he received the dignity of knighthood. The University of Oxford conferred on him the honorary degree of D.C.L. Sir Richard Westmacott's lectures were treatises of considerable archæological research, interspersed with practical remarks of great force and shrewdness, and accompanied by admirable drawings. On the subject of Greek Art, Sir R. Westmacott, if not a profound scholar, was as deeply versed by practical study as any member of the Academy. Yet in composition, though thoroughly appreciating the ancient schools, and competent to pass unerring judgment on the genuineness of works reputed antique, the leaning of his style was certainly towards the naturalistic in sculpture. He sought to present thought and emotion rather under their modern and national types, than under the old-world conventionalities of Greek and Roman artists, however masterly and attractive may be the productions they have handed down to us. At the same time the purity of his taste, which had been formed upon these very models, induced him to be severe rather than florid in his composition, with a constant tendency to reject the superfluities of a subject, and to reduce it down to its leading and characteristic features. Sir Richard Westmacott took an active part in the proceedings of the Royal Academy, and was a member of the Council of that body. His son, Mr. Richard Westmacott, is also a distinguished member of the Royal Academy.

2. At Wilton Street, aged 55, Dudley Montague Perceval, esq., fourth son of the late Right Hon. Spencer Perceval, who was shot by Bellingham in the lobby of the House of Commons. Mr. Perceval received his early education at Harrow, whence he proceeded to Oxford, and in 1822 took a first-class degree. He entered at Lincoln's Inn, but was compelled to relinquish the legal profession by a weak state of health. He then went to the Cape of Good Hope, where, for several years, he filled the office of Clerk of the

Council, under the Governorship of Sir Richard Bourke. Having in July, 1827, been united in marriage to Sir Richard's eldest daughter, who, with a son and daughter, the issue of the marriage, survives him, he returned to this country in the year 1828, and was appointed to the office of first clerk and deputy teller of the Exchequer—his eldest brother, Mr. Spencer Perceval, being one of the tellers—which he held until the year 1834, when the tellerships of the Exchequer were abolished.

Mr. Perceval was warmly and conscientiously attached to the Established Church, and was a staunch supporter of the Protestant constitution in Church and State. It was to the advocacy of these principles that his life was devoted. He opposed Catholic Emancipation to the last, and insisted upon securities, some of which were disregarded, and others taken and neglected. Thereafter upon every occasion on which the Roman Catholics appeared to encroach on the supremacy of the Crown or the rights of the Church, Mr. Perceval appeared in arms, and by speeches, letters, and pamphlets, vindicated the Protestant constitution. In like manner, and with the same warmth, the several propositions for the admission of the Jews into Parliament, and the various concessions to the Dissenters, received his strenuous opposition. While thus always ready to show front to the external enemies of the Church, Mr. Perceval was an enthusiastic supporter of its highest internal pretensions. He was pre-eminently a High Churchman, and jealous to guard its action from the interference of the State; he supported education by the Church, in opposition to the secular tendencies of the Privy Council scheme; and he strongly maintained the revival of Convocation. The principal occasion on which Mr. Perceval came prominently before the public, was on occasion of Mr. Gladstone's re-election for Oxford University, on the formation of the Coalition Cabinet. This statesman had, in various ways, lost the confidence of many of the leading members of the University, especially upon points on which Mr. Perceval retained their full faith. He declared himself a candidate for the representation. The result was a vast amount of bitterness and ill-feeling among a class of estimable men; the contest was protracted, and hundreds were put to great expense, but Mr. Gladstone secured his return.

3. At Malling Deanery, Lewes, aged 56, Anthony Sheppey Greene, esq., Treasurer to the Eastern Division of Sussex.

DEATHS.—SEPT.

5. At his seat, Oving House, near Aylesbury, aged 73, Sir Thomas Digby Aubrey, bart. He was the seventh Baronet of an old knightly race, and son of Richard Aubrey, by the second daughter of the Hon. Wriothesley Digby. In him the title and the old family of the Aubreys become extinct.

— At his Grace the Duke of Buccleuch's villa, Richmond, Surrey, Louisa Grace, relict of Major-Gen. William Henry Cornwall.

6. At Horksley Hall, Essex, aged 92, Catherine, relict of Lieut.-Col. Watson, late of the 3rd Light Dragoons, and of Westwood House.

— In St. Marylebone Workhouse, New Road, where she had been thirty-four years, in the 107th year of her age Catherine Hughes. She had the possession of all her faculties up to the day of her death, and she used frequently to talk to the guardians, by whom she was much respected, upon events which took place in the early part of her life. One of her sons is still living, he being 85 years of age.

6. At Great Yarmouth, aged 76, of ossification of the heart, Mr. William Yarrell, the eminent naturalist. William Yarrell was born in June, 1784, in Duke Street, St. James's, where his father carried on the business of a newspaper agent, and to which he succeeded in due time. His earliest pleasures appear to have been angling and shooting, in both of which he was a proficient. But these idle amusements were not idly pursued by young Yarrell; he soon began to study minutely the natural history and habits of the game he hunted, to make collections—in fact, he became a naturalist. In this way he formed valuable collections of fishes, birds, and birds'-eggs, studying and making notes of their habits, when, at about the age of forty, he may be said to have laid down the rod and gun for the pen. On the 25th of March, 1825, he addressed to the conductors of the "Zoological Journal" his first composition, consisting of "Notices of the Occurrence of some rare British Birds, observed during the years 1823, '24, and '25." Having made the acquaintance of several zealous naturalists, he was elected, in 1825, a Fellow of the Linnæan Society, and in 1827 communicated to the Society's "Transactions" a paper, entitled "Observations on the Tracheæ of Birds, with Descriptions and Representations of several not hitherto figured." Later in the same year he presented to the Royal Society a paper "On the Change in the Plumage of

some Hen-Pheasants," which was printed in the Philosophical Transactions. Notwithstanding, however, the Council of the Royal Society considered Mr. Yarrell's paper worthy a place in their "Transactions," the author was never elected to the Fellowship.

In 1829 Mr. Yarrell communicated to the Linnæan Society the "Description of a New Species of *Tringa*, killed in Cambridgeshire, new to England and Europe;" and the following year two papers "On the Organs of Voice in Birds," and "On a New Species of Wild Swan taken in England." About this time the Zoological Club of the Linnæan Society, of which Mr. Yarrell had for six years been an active member, became the foundation of the present Zoological Society, and his exertions for this Society's welfare were continued with unremitting zeal to the last. He was a frequent contributor to the "Proceedings" of this Society, to the Linnæan Society, the Zoological Journal, and other scientific journals. The grand work of his life was the production, during the years 1830-40, of the two well-known "Histories of British Birds and British Fishes," published by Mr. Van Voorst. In 1849 Mr. Yarrell was elected a Vice-President and Treasurer of the Linnæan Society, and the members subscribed for a portrait of him in oil, which is suspended in the Society's meeting-room. In addition to his collections of British natural history, Mr. Yarrell possessed a valuable library of books in that class of literature.

8. At Draycott House, Derby, aged 38, the Hon. Robert Dundas Murray, youngest son of the seventh Lord Elibank.

— At Sandhurst, Louisa Augusta, wife of Lieut.-Colonel P. L. Macdougall, and daughter of Lieut.-General Sir William Napier.

16. At Thirlestane Castle, aged 94, the Right Hon. Eleanor, Countess of Lauderdale, widow of James, eighth Earl of Lauderdale, who died in 1839.

— At Shirley, Southampton, aged 61, John Beresford, esq., eldest son of the late and brother of the present Bishop of Kilmore, and for thirty-one years Colonial Secretary of the Island of St. Vincent, West Indies.

17. At Castellamare, Naples, the Hon. Susan Agnes, wife of Francis Dennis Massy Dawson, esq., and eldest daughter of Lord Sinclair.

19. At Kingstown, aged 81, the Dowager Countess of Howth, sister of the late Sir John Burke, bart., of Marble Hill, co. Galway.

20. At his apartments in Greenwich Hospital, Captain George Moubray, R.N., one of the Captains of Greenwich Hospital, aged 83.

Captain Moubray, who entered the navy in 1789, was acting as master's mate of the *Juno*, 32, Captain Hood, when she effected an extraordinary escape from the harbour of Toulon, into which she had entered in ignorance of the evacuation of the British. Being shortly afterwards received on board the *Victory*, 100, flag-ship of Lord Hood, he served in the boats at the sieges of St. Fiorenzo and Bastia. He was promoted, May 27, 1794, to a lieutenantancy in *La Moselle*, sloop, in which he was present at Hotham's first partial action, March 14, 1795. After much active service in various ships, he was appointed First-Lieutenant of the *Polyphemus*, 64, Captain Robert Redmill, part of the victorious fleet employed in the ensuing action off Cape Trafalgar. Succeeding to the command of the latter ship immediately after the action, owing to the serious illness of his Captain, Lieutenant Moubray had the good fortune, during the gale that followed, to regain possession of the *Argonauta*, Spanish 80, and deliver her over to Admiral Collingwood, off Cadiz. He afterwards took in tow the *Victory*, with the body of Lord Nelson on board, and conducted her to the mouth of the Straits of Gibraltar; and he also, in spite of her mutinous crew, carried the *Swiftsure*, French 74, in a similar manner from the neighbourhood of Cadiz to Gibraltar. In 1812-13 he served in the West Indies. He attained post rank in 1812, and was not again employed until September 23, 1844, when he obtained command of the *Victory*, 104, at Portsmouth, which he retained until admitted into Greenwich Hospital, March 25, 1846.

22. At Winkfield, Berks, aged 78, the Hon. and Rev. Richard Fitzgerald King, B.A. 1799, M.A. 1828, at St. Mary Hall, Oxford, fourth son of Robert, second Earl of Kingston.

— At Westbourne Terrace, Hyde Park, aged 75, William Hunter, esq., one of the Aldermen of London, and a magistrate for Middlesex.

— In Jermyn Street, St. James's, aged 74, Major-General James Jones, K.H. and K. of the Order of Charles III. of Spain. He served in the 15th Dragoons in the Peninsula. Besides numerous minor affairs, he was engaged with his regiment at Talavera and Barossa, for which he received the silver medal.

23. At Andley End, aged 56, Lady Braybrooke, eldest daughter of the second Marquis Cornwallis, and married, in 1819, to the present Lord Braybrooke. Two of her sons, Captain Neville, of the Grenadier Guards, and Mr. Grey Neville, of the 5th Dragoon Guards, fell in the late war, in which no less than four grandsons of Marquis Cornwallis gave up their lives to their country, viz. the two gallant officers just named, Captain Eliot, of the Coldstream Guards, son of the Countess of St. Germans, and Captain Ross, of the 3rd Buffs, son of Lady Mary Ross.

— After a few hours' illness, aged 47, John Gurney, esq., of Earlam Hall, Norwich.

— At Exeter, aged 79, Peregrine Masingbird, esq., last surviving son of Bennet Langton, esq., of Langton, Lincolnshire, and Mary, Countess Dowager of Rothes.

— At Erith, Mrs. Sarah Lee, formerly Mrs. Bowdich, aged 65, well known to naturalists as the biographer of Cuvier, and the author of several admirable zoological works for young people; and, in a wider circle, admired for her vigorous career in early life as the affectionate and devoted companion of one of our earliest explorers of Western Africa.

Mrs. Lee was the only daughter of John Eglinton Wallis, esq., of Colchester. At the age of 21 she married Mr. T. E. Bowdich, a zealous cultivator of natural history, and became gradually educated in his pursuits. After a few years Mr. Bowdich proceeded to Africa on a mission to Ashantee, and his wife set off alone to join him. On reaching Cape Coast Castle she found to her dismay that he had crossed her on the seas to return home. He then made a second voyage to Africa, and they set forth on their researches together, during which she achieved wonders by her devoted love and bravery. Returning to England, the results of their mutual labours were presented to the public in some excellent works on the geography and natural history of the countries they had traversed. As an example of Mr. Bowdich's zeal in his pursuits, we may here mention an anecdote related by himself—that a phrenologist meeting him one evening at one of Sir Joseph Banks' *soirées*, remarked to him, "You are the very man we want. We want a naturalist who is a mathematician." "I know nothing of mathematics," was the reply. "Whether you know it or not," said the phrenologist, "you are a mathematician." Mr. Bowdich, awakened by this incident to the possession

of a faculty which had scarcely occurred to him, devoted himself to study, and gained the Cambridge prize of 1000*l.* for a discovery which was dependent on mathematics.

In 1823 the travellers returned to Africa, visiting Madeira on the way—the husband never to return. Mr. Bowdich died at Bathurst in January, 1824. The first solicitude of the bereaved widow was to arrange her husband's manuscripts for publication, and as early as March of the following year she published a handsome quarto volume, illustrated by coloured geological sections, views, and costumes, and zoological figures. The simplicity and feeling, and admirable detail with which this work is composed, at once gave Mrs. Bowdich a position in the society of naturalists, and her activity and pleasing manners excited general sympathy. On the return of Mr. and Mrs. Bowdich from Africa, in 1818, they had visited Paris and made the acquaintance of Cuvier. The Baron received them with great kindness and hospitality, and for four years they lived on the most intimate terms with his amiable family, availing themselves to their heart's content of the use of his library, drawings, and collections. On the occasion of her widowhood, Mrs. Bowdich again visited Paris, and was received by Baron Cuvier almost as a daughter. She remained there some years, during which time she made the acquaintance of many distinguished men of Paris, and on the death of Cuvier repaid the tribute of his esteem by the publication of an interesting biographical memoir of upwards of 300 pages, in which she was assisted by Baron Pasquier, M. Laurillard, Dr. Duvernoy, and Baron Humboldt. Three years previous to this she published a "History of British Fresh-water Fishes," illustrated with drawings by herself, pronounced by Cuvier, in his "*Table des Auteurs*" (*Règne Animal*, edit. 1830), to be *très belles*. She had now married Mr. Lee, and the remainder of her useful literary life was mainly devoted to the composition of books of minor pretension, founded chiefly on her experiences in travel and natural-history researches. These were very popular, and are still esteemed among the best introduction for young people to the study of natural history.

In private life Mrs. Lee was beloved by all who knew her. Her talents she used unweariedly, unselfishly. Her spirit was oppressed by no pride of intellect or vanity. She bore up like a heroine under burdens

which would have prostrated most women, and all from a natural impulse of love and duty. During the last two years of her life, her labours were honoured by a recognition of the Government in a pension of 50*l.*

24. At his seat, South Park, near Tunbridge Wells, aged 71, the Right Hon. Henry, first Lord Hardinge, a Field Marshal, &c. &c.

The deceased Commander was the third son of the Rev. Henry Hardinge, Rector of Stanhope, in the county of Durham, and entered the army at a very early age, having been gazetted as ensign before he had attained his fifteenth year. He fought through the whole of the Peninsular War, was distinguished for his early gallantry at the evacuation of Corunna, and fully sustained his reputation in those immortal fields which are household words in the military history of England. Young Hardinge (for at the peace of 1815 he was only just thirty) was attached to the Portuguese army from 1809 to 1813, in the capacity of Deputy Quartermaster-General. He was present at the passage of the Douro, at the battle of Bnsaco, and in the lines of Torres Vedras. At the battle of Albuera he first earned a name in history, and mainly contributed to the success of that memorable charge by which the fortunes of the day were retrieved. At the sieges of Badajoz and Ciudad Rodrigo, at the great battles of Salamanca and Vittoria (in which last he was wounded)—at Pampeluna, the Pyrenees, Nivelle, Nive, Orthes, the young and gallant soldier followed the standard of the great captain who first taught Europe that the imperial arms of France were not invincible. When Napoleon effected his memorable return from Elba, and the battle of Europe had to be fought over again, Hardinge, now decorated with honours and advanced in rank, hastened to join the allied armies in Belgium. Being in the full confidence of the Duke of Wellington, he was entrusted with the important office of Commissioner at the Prussian head-quarters—a duty on which mainly depended the joint action of the two armies. In this capacity he attended Blucher's staff at the battle of Ligny, on the 16th June. His left hand was taken off by a shot, and this misfortune prevented his presence on the field of Waterloo. Eight years after peace was concluded the distinguished young General took his first step in a new career, having been created Clerk of the Ordnance in 1823. In 1826 he entered Parliament.

On the accession of the Duke of Wellington to the Prime Ministership of this country, Hardinge was offered, and accepted, the post of Secretary at War. In 1830 he was made Secretary of Ireland—an office to which he was re-appointed during the brief ministry of Sir Robert Peel in 1834–35. When Sir Robert returned to power in 1841, Sir Henry Hardinge resumed his previous post of Secretary at War, and held it till 1844, when he went out as Governor General of India. Most readers are familiar with the history of the eventful four years—from 1844 to 1847—of his Indian administration. Few passages in our recent annals are better known than the brilliant period of the great Sikh wars—Moodkee, Aliwal, and Sobraon are imperishable names—nor will it be readily forgotten that throughout the whole campaign the Governor General of India, though virtually superintending the conduct of the war, was content to act as second in command. When the contest was determinated by the pacification of Lahore, the Governor General of India was brilliantly rewarded. He was created Viscount Hardinge of Lahore, the East India Company granted him a pension of 5000*l.* a year, and Parliament voted an annuity of 3000*l.* for himself and his next two successors. On the death of the great Duke, in September, 1852, Lord Hardinge was appointed Commander-in-Chief, and on the 2nd of October last year was advanced to the rank of Field Marshal.

An obituary of the deceased Marshal, which appeared in *The Times*, gives an admirable sketch of his character:—

“It is with very sincere regret that we have to record the death of Field Marshal Lord Hardinge, which took place yesterday, at his country seat, near Tunbridge Wells. Few officers have served so long and with so many opportunities of distinction, and of Lord Hardinge it must be said, that in the field he was always found equal to the occasion. We do not claim for the gallant soldier who has just departed from among us the praise of military genius of the highest order. He was neither a Marlborough, a Napoleon, nor a Wellington, but the work which he had to do he always performed efficiently and well. From the lowest grade he rose to the very highest rank in the British army, by his own deserts. He was not connected by birth with any noble family, nor with any influential clique in military circles; and yet he became Commander-in-Chief. Slender indeed was the chance that Henry

Hardinge, the son of a clergyman in the North of England, who entered the army as ensign in the year 1798, should have attained the dignities of Governor General of British India and of Commander-in-Chief. It may be said that the accidents of life were on his side, but they were no more so than in the case of a thousand others who have passed away, their names unknown. The very turning point of his career affords evidence that he was a man destined to conquer in the battle of life. Lord Hardinge used frequently to tell the story how, after the battle of Corunna, when the English troops were hurrying on board ship, a staff officer was anxious to gain the friendly shelter of the English fleet. The keen eye of Marshal Beresford, who was superintending the embarkation, detected the vigour and capacity of a young officer who was employing himself most zealously in the discharge of his duty. That young officer was Henry Hardinge, and from that moment his fortune was made. He was required to act in the place of the expeditious staff officer, and Lord Beresford never forgot his activity and zeal. At a subsequent period, when Beresford was charged with the important duty of preparing the Portuguese forces to take an active share in the contest with the veteran troops of Napoleon, he remembered the young officer who had done such good service on the beach at Corunna, and summoned him to his aid. He gave him a brigade in the Portuguese service, ‘before he was twenty-five,’ and after a time his foreign grade was commuted for British rank. But for this fortunate ‘accident,’ as Lord Hardinge used to call it, his fate might have been, according to his own opinion, that of a hundred others. He might have died a colonel on half-pay, after thirty years of hard service in every corner of the British empire. We doubt if this would have been the case. For men of so energetic a stamp—so fitted by nature for the career on which they have entered—‘accidents’ are ever occurring which they are ever prepared to turn to account. To give but a suggestion of the actions in which this brave soldier was engaged, is to recall the leading events of the most glorious and successful war in which the British arms have been engaged since the days of Marlborough. During the whole of the Peninsular contest he acted as Deputy Quartermaster-General of the Portuguese army. He was wounded at Vimiera; he was present at Roleia;—we have already mentioned the distinction he ob-

tained at Corunna. When Wellesley entered on the scene as acknowledged chief, we find him at the passage of the Douro, at the battle of Busaco, and actively engaged in organizing the defence behind the memorable lines of Torres Vedras. He was present at the three sieges, and at the final capture of Ciudad Rodrigo. It was, however, at the battle of Albuera that Lord Hardinge performed the chief feat of his military career. That battle, as is well known, was offered to Soult by Beresford with mere valour than discretion. During the progress of it Beresford, as ever, distinguished himself by the greatest personal courage; but the fortune of the day was turned by a happy manœuvre, executed by young Hardinge without orders, and on his own responsibility. The battle was one of the most bloody on record, in proportion to the number of combatants. As General Napier writes,—‘The rain flowed after in streams discoloured with blood, and 1,500 unwounded men, the remnant of 6,000 unconquerable British soldiers, stood triumphant on the fatal hill.’

“Hardinge fought at Salamanca; he was severely wounded at Vittoria; he was at Pampeluna; he crossed the Pyrenees with the conquering British army; he was at Nivelle, at Nive, at Orthes. After the return of Napoleon from Elba, he again entered upon active service, and was attached as Commissioner to the Prussian army. He lost a hand under Blucher at Ligny,—and this was his share in the Waterloo campaign.

“When peace was restored to the world, he did not retire into inactivity, but continued, in one important post or another, in the service of his country. We do not here pretend to give a list of the successive offices which he held. He was successively Secretary-at War, Secretary for Ireland, Master-General of the Ordnance, and, finally, in the year 1844 he was raised to the high dignity of Governor-General of India. The four years during which he held the reigns of government in that distant region were memorable even in the eventful history of British India. The events of the Sikh campaign are too fresh in the public recollection to need recapitulation here. No one has forgotten, when the storm of war suddenly broke upon the north-western frontier of our Indian possessions, with what energy the brave old soldier hurried to the scene of action—with what disinterested feeling the Governor-General postponed all questions of dignity, and acted as second in command during the fiery days of Moodkee, of Ferozeshah, and

of Sobraon. Independently of these great military achievements, the Indian administration of Lord Hardinge was in other respects crowned with success. It was he who originated the policy with regard to the kingdom of Oude, which Lord Dalhousie, at a subsequent period, had the nerve and intelligence to carry out to its legitimate fulfilment. In October, 1852, four years after the expiration of his Indian government, Lord Hardinge was raised to the highest post within the ambition of a military man—he was appointed Commander-in-chief, to succeed the Duke of Wellington. This important post he held until a very recent period, and throughout the eventful epoch of the Russian war. Few men have actually seen war upon so great a scale, or been concerned in directing operations of such magnitude at home. It was not Lord Hardinge’s fault, nor can it be imputed as blame to him, that he inherited the traditions and practices of a glorious period in the military annals of Great Britain, which had served their turn full well, but were no longer applicable to the exigencies of modern warfare.

“There must have been some extraordinary qualities in a man who could rise to such eminent employments without ever having had—save in the memorable instance of Albuera—the chief direction of any great military achievement in the field. In the Peninsula Lord Hardinge was always under command—in India he modestly took the second place under Lord Gough—in the recent conflict with Russia his office was rather one of selection than of direct participation, and in his selections he was not very fortunate. The qualities which seem to have recommended Lord Hardinge to honour and fame were, in the first place, unflinching courage in the most terrible trials or in the most unexpected turns of war. He was distinguished, moreover, by a buoyancy of spirit, by a cheerfulness, by a geniality which made him ever acceptable to those around him. Almost to the last, when the weight of years and of lengthened service was beginning to tell upon him, he was a ready and efficient man of business. A character and habits such as these, joined to unwearied zeal, and to a never-failing sense of duty, will be sufficient to account for the honours which he attained without insulting the memory of so gallant and deserving a man with fulsome and superfluous flattery.”

It is right to add, that a controversy has arisen as to whom the credit of the advance of Cole’s division at the battle of Albuera

DEATHS.—OCT.

was due. It has been claimed for Sir Lowry Cole himself; but all agree in attributing to Colonel Hardinge the suggestion or approval of the movement.

The remains of the Field Marshal were interred in the churchyard of the little village of Fordcomb.

24. At his residence, Chelsea Hospital, aged 82, General Sir Colin Halkett, G.C.B., K.C.H., &c.

The gallant deceased was eldest son of Major-General Frederick Halkett. Sir Colin attained the rank of Lieut.-Colonel in 1803. He was directed to join the army in the Peninsula, and was appointed to the command of a brigade of the German Legion, and during that command took an active part in the battles of Albuera, Salamanca, Vittoria, and the passage of the Nive,—for his services at which he received a cross. The gallant General was also at Waterloo, under the command of General Lord Hill. At that signal victory Sir Colin's division was hotly engaged, and he had four horses shot under him, and also received four wounds—one through the face, the shot carrying away a portion of his palate, one at the back of the neck, another in the thigh, and one in his heel. Sir Colin Halkett's active military career closed with this great battle. In 1830 he was appointed Colonel of the 31st Foot, and in 1847 was transferred to the Colonelcy-in-Chief of the 45th Foot. The gallant General was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Chelsea Hospital; but a few months after the death of General Sir George Anson vacated the Governorship, when the Duke of Wellington at once conferred the honourable appointment on the gallant deceased. Sir Colin, having gone through all the minor classes of the Order of the Bath, was nominated a Grand Cross of the military division in 1848. He was also a Knight Grand Cross of the Hanoverian Guelphic Order, a Knight Third Class of Wilhelm of the Netherlands, a Knight Commander of the Bavarian Order of Maximilian Joseph, and a Knight of the Tower and Sword of Portugal.

25. At Rolleston Hall, Staffordshire, aged 51, Oswald, eldest son of Sir Oswald Mosley, bart.

28. At Dromoland, in the county of Clare, Lady O'Brien, widow of the late Sir Edward O'Brien, bart., M.P. The death of this much esteemed lady was occasioned by injuries received by a fall down stairs. In Lady O'Brien were combined all the graces and accomplishments, as well as virtues, that could adorn her sex. By Lady

O'Brien's demise vast estates in the counties of Limerick and Clare will devolve on her eldest son, Lord Inchiquin, Lord Lieut. of the county of Clare; and her second son, Mr. William Smith O'Brien, esq., of Cahermoyle, obtains an increase to his income from the family property of about £3000 per annum.

30. At Keythorpe Hall, Leicestershire, aged 56, the Lady Berners, wife of Lord Berners, of Keythorpe Hall.

— Accidentally drowned, at Leixlepp Castle, near Dublin, the Baron de Roebeck. The sudden disappearance of this respected nobleman gave rise to much uneasiness and suspicion. It was not until the 11th of October that his corpse was found in the river Liffey, under circumstances which leave no doubt that he met his death by accidental drowning. The body, which was found in an advanced state of decomposition, had on it the clothes which the Baron wore on the 30th of September, and all the appendages—viz. a gold watch and chain, gold spectacles, gold eye-glass, gold pencilcase, &c., were found in their proper places. The gloves were on the hands of the body, but the right boot was missing. It is supposed that in the effort to extricate the body from the sand, in which it was deeply imbedded, the boot came off the right foot and remained behind. An inquest having been held, the jury returned the following verdict—"We find that the late Baron de Roebeck was found drowned in the river Liffey, in Capt. Colthurst's demesne, on the evening of the 11th of October, and we believe him to have been accidentally drowned near the Salmon Leap on the evening of the 30th September last."

— At Blaircastle, Miss Francis Bruce Dundas, of Blaircastle.

Lately. At Stone, aged 103, John Hodson. Until within the last twelve months he might daily be seen driving cows to milk through the town. He possessed the perfect use of his faculties, with the exception of his hearing, till the last.

OCTOBER.

1. At Grandtully Castle, Perthshire, Lady Stewart, of Grandtully.

— At Gosden, near Guildford, aged 47, Col. Frederick Geo. Shewell, K.B., 8th Hussars. Col. Shewell had been 30 years in the service, commanded the 8th Hussars at the famous Balaklava charge, where he brought a portion of the brigade out of action; and subsequently held the rank of

DEATHS.—OCT.

Brig.-Gen. in the Crimea, for which he was made a C.B., and awarded a pension for distinguished services.

5. At Grimston, near Tadcaster, Yorkshire, aged 17, the Hon. Isabella Maria Denison, second surviving daughter of the Right Hon. Lord Londesborough.

— In St. Martin's, Lincoln, aged 101, Mrs. Hannah Smith, widow. Until very lately she was able to walk alone, and her faculties remained clear and strong.

6. Sir Jasper Atkinson, Knt., of Portman Square, London, and North Frith, Tonbridge, Kent. This gentleman was born September 12, 1790. His family had been long connected with the Royal Mint, of which he became an official himself in 1804. The alteration by the Government in 1851 of the arrangement of that body, and the ancient Company of Moneyers, of which he was Provost, dissolved his connection with the royal establishment, when Sir Jasper, with the rest of the Moneyers (the elder members of which are all since dead), after retiring on pensions, passed the residue of their lives in honourable privacy. No one was more zealous in all matters relative to this indispensable institution than the subject of this brief memoir, and in addition to his receiving, as a testimony of his worth, presents from the body to which he belonged, he worthily obtained the honour of Knighthood in 1842, at the instance of the King of the French, Louis Philippe. Although he had been also mainly instrumental in improving the mints for the Turkish and Russian Governments, from whom he also received marks of their satisfaction, he continued a most devoted and useful officer in this establishment, where his late father, William Henry Atkinson, esq., had also been a faithful functionary for 34 years of a very extended life. The nation is truly indebted to him, to his father, and to his ancestor, Henry Van Der Esche, who came over with King William III. from Holland, as one of his private secretaries, and subsequently introduced his son, of the same names, into the Mint, then located in the Tower, as Deputy-Master Worker. The brother of Sir Jasper, a very efficient naval officer, Sir Henry Atkinson, also received the honour of Knighthood, and has added to the honour of the family. Sir Jasper married, May 12, 1819, Louisa Jane Grace, only daughter of the late Captain William Gyll, of the 2nd Life Guards, son and heir of William Gyll, esq., of Wraysbury House, Bucks, and Yeoveny Hall, Middlesex.

She survives him, and has an only child married to William Gowing, esq.

6. At Paris, a lady who once occupied a prominent place in London society, the Baroness de Calabrella; the Baroness was sister to the once celebrated Ball Hughes, better known as the "Golden Ball," whose fashionable eccentricities and marriage with the opera dancer, Mercandotti, made so much noise in the world—"when George the Fourth was King."

8. Aged 38, the Hon. Charles Grimston, third son of the late Earl of Verulam, formerly of the Coldstream Guards, and brother of the Countess of Clarendon.

10. At Bath, aged 66, John Wood, esq., Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue. Mr. Wood represented Preston in the three Parliaments of 1826, 1830, and in 1831, a period memorable for the political excitement which then prevailed consequent on the Parliamentary Reform agitation. He soon established for himself a high character in the House of Commons amongst men of business, and was solicited by the Government to fill the important post of Chairman of the Board of Stamps and Taxes. Upon the consolidation of that Board with the Commissioners of Excise Mr. Wood was appointed Chairman of the united Board, which post he filled to the complete satisfaction of every successive administration.

— At Newton-Anner, county of Tipperary, Catherine, widow of Sir Thomas Osborne, bart.

— At St. John's, Newfoundland, the Rev. Jacob George Mountain, Principal of St. John's College. This exemplary clergyman was the second son of the Rev. J. H. B. Mountain, D.D., a prebendary of Lincoln, and nephew of the Right Rev. G. J. Mountain, D.D., Bishop of Quebec. He was educated on the foundation of Eton School, where he gained, in 1837, in addition to other honours, the "Newcastle Medal," given to the second best competitor for the Classical Scholarship founded, in 1829, by the late Duke of Newcastle. Mr. Mountain did not succeed to a scholarship at King's College, Cambridge, but was presented by Eton College with one of the valuable scholarships in their gift at Merton College, Oxford, called "postmasterships." After leaving Oxford, he returned to Eton as a private tutor, accepting also the curacy of Clewer, near Windsor. Some nine years ago he determined to sacrifice his prospects at home for the arduous position of a missionary in Newfoundland, and he went out to Bishop Field, a man like-minded with

himself, though many efforts were made by his friends to retain him in this country. In his Christian mission Mr. Mountain gained the love of his flock, and the affection of his Bishop, who writes of the loss he has sustained in touching terms.

12. In St. James's Place, aged 77, the Right Hon. Cornwallis, third Viscount Hawarden.

13. Of cholera, the renowned General Guyon (Kurschid Pacha). He was born at Bath, his father being a captain in the English navy. In 1821, being then 18, he got a commission in the Austrian army; he subsequently married a Hungarian lady with considerable landed property, and became a Hungarian country gentleman, in which capacity he took up arms at the head of a section of revolutionists of 1848, to oppose Jellachich. His career from this point is historical—the brilliant engagements he led, and his overthrow, with Bem and Kmety, through the patriotism of Gorgey sacrificing himself rather than his men. He fled with the rest of the Hungarian leaders to Turkey. Guyon, however, although offered a command in Damascus, with the rank of Lieut.-Gen. and the title of Kurschid (the Sun) Pacha, steadfastly refused to embrace the Mahometan faith, and this at the time when he was actually starving from want. It was only when every effort had been abandoned as hopeless, that the authorities at Constantinople accepted Guyon's services on his own terms. He was the first Christian who obtained the rank of Pacha and a Turkish military command without betraying his religion. At the breaking out of the Russian war General Guyon set himself resolutely to re-organize the army of Asia Minor; but the prejudices, ignorance, and incapacity, but above all the corruption of the Turkish authorities, paralyzed all his efforts; and when at length an army was collected in some strength and discipline, the presumption of the Turkish Pashas exposed it to defeat and destruction.

— At Bersted-lodge, aged 89, Susan Mackworth, widow of Thomas Smith, esq., of Bersted-lodge, Sussex.

— At Nazing Park, Essex, aged 87, Anna Maria, widow of George Palmer, esq., who for many years represented the Southern Division of the county in Parliament.

16. At 21, Holywell Street, Millbank, Westminster, John Bernard Sale, esq., Organist and Gentleman of Her Majesty's Chapel Royal, and Lay Vicar of Westminster Abbey. Mr. Sale was the son of

the late Mr. John Sale, formerly the principal base-singer at the King's Concert of Ancient Music, &c., for whom Calcott wrote his fine songs, and who was himself, at one time, a member of five choirs, namely, Eton, Windsor, the Chapel Royal, St. Paul's, and Westminster Abbey. Mr. John Bernard Sale was born at Windsor, June 24, 1779; admitted a chorister at Windsor and Eton in 1785; in 1800 became Lay Vicar of Westminster Abbey; in 1803 was appointed Gentleman of the Chapel Royal; and in 1838 one of the organists. Mr. Sale had the honour of being selected as the musical instructor of Her Majesty, when Princess Victoria, an appointment which he owed no less to his high character than to his professional eminence as a teacher; and as he was a true disciple of Handel, he was zealous in inspiring his royal pupil with a similar taste. Her Majesty has bestowed an annuity of 50*l.* upon his two unmarried daughters. Some of Mr. Sale's musical compositions obtained popularity.

16. At Cowhill, near Dumfries, N.B., aged 92, Vice-Admiral Chas. Jas. Johnston, on the list of flag-officers on reserved half-pay in receipt of service-pensions. He served at the capture of the Cape in 1795; at the surrender of Columbo, and the destruction of armed vessels in the Java Seas in 1796; commanded the *Cornwallis*, 50, in company with the *Sceptre*, 74, and attacked the French frigate *Semillante*, and shipping in St. Paul's Bay, Isle of Bourbon, in 1806. He commanded the *Powerful*, 74, in the Walcheren expedition.

19. At Royal Crescent, Bath, aged 57, Rear-Adm. the Hon. George Frederick Hotham. He served at the destruction of the French 40-gun frigates *l'Arienne* and *l'Andromaque*, and the 16-gun brig *Mamelouck*, off l'Orient, in 1812; and was midshipman of the *Ramillies*, 74, during the operations on the coast of America, including Moose Island, Baltimore, and New Orleans.

— At his seat, near Rickmansworth, Herts, Vice-Admiral the Hon. Josceline Percy, C.B. The gallant deceased was second surviving son of Algernon, first Earl of Beverley. He served as a midshipman in the *Victory* flag-ship of Lord Nelson. He had the chief command at the Cape of Good Hope up to the spring of 1846, and was Commander-in-Chief at Sheerness for three years.

20. At Darrynivee, near Kish, in the parish of Drumkeeran, county Fermanagh, aged 108, Mr. William Crawford. The

DEATHS.—Nov.

week before he died he was on the top of a hay-rick making it up. He was never known to have been ill until an hour before he died. Another man, named Jones, aged 107, and a woman turned 105, are now living in the same parish.

22. At Castlemilk, Dumfriesshire, David Jardine, esq., the head of the great firm of Jardine, Matheson, and Co., of China. Mr. Jardine had only recently returned to his native country, after having amassed probably one of the most colossal fortunes ever brought from the East.

24. At his residence, Westfield Lodge, Brighton, aged 61, William Clarkson, esq., of the Inner Temple, recorder of Faversham, celebrated as a criminal counsel.

26. At Haslar Hospital, a few hours after being landed from H.M.S. *Hannibal*, Mr. John Hayles, Gunner, R.N., late of H.M.S. *Beagle*, from disease contracted while doing duty in the trenches before Sebastopol; he also distinguished himself in the Sea of Azoff, for which he received promotion, was mentioned in public dispatches, and nominated for the Legion of Honour.

— At Ipswich Union House, aged 75, John Claxon. He was on board the *Victory*, Lord Nelson's ship, on the memorable 1st of October, 1805; and he saw his commander fall.

— At Lyne Grove, Chertsey, Elizabeth, wife of William Dodsworth, esq., only surviving sister of Sir J. Y. Buller, bart., M.P. for Devonshire.

27. Of bronchitis, at Avignon, in the South of France, aged 72, the Hon. Henrietta Countess de Salis, of Dawley-court, Uxbridge.

29. At his seat, Sanbeck Park, near Tickhill, Yorkshire, the Right Hon. John Lumley Saville, Earl of Scarborough, Viscount Lumley and Baron Lumley of Lumley Castle, in the county of Durham, in the peerage of England; Viscount Lumley, of Waterford, in the peerage of Ireland. The deceased nobleman was the eighth Earl of Scarborough, and the lineal representative of a family which traces its pedigree to a period considerably anterior to the Norman Conquest, and which has constantly produced historic personages on the field of English history. The ancient family name of Lumley is derived from a village and castle on the banks of the Wear; that of Saville from the marriage of the fourth Earl with the sister and heiress of Sir George Saville. The deceased peer succeeded as the eighth Earl on the 21st of February, 1835, his father having been

killed by a fall from a horse. Prior to his accession, the deceased nobleman represented the county of Nottingham in the House of Commons, having been elected by that constituency in the years 1826, 1830, 1831, and 1832. In 1839 he was appointed Lord Lieutenant of the county of Nottingham, in the room of the late Duke of Newcastle, who was summarily removed for having written an offensive letter to the Lord Chancellor Cottenham. The deceased Earl, who was never married, had an illegitimate family, to whom he has left a large portion of his immense estates. The present Earl, his nephew, nevertheless receives an estate of the value of 23,000*l.* a year, but burdened with a large incumbrance.

29. Much respected, aged 68, J. F. Hughes, esq., M.D., Acton House; chairman of the bench of magistrates at Wrexham, and also senior deputy-lieutenant for the county of Denbigh.

31. At Great Amwell, Herts, aged 73, Albany Carrington Bond, esq. The deceased was uncle to John Neeld, esq., M.P., and the late Joseph Neeld, esq., late M.P. for Chippenham.

— At his seat, Castle Bernard, Cork, aged 72, the Right Hon. James, Earl of Bandon, Viscount Bernard, &c. The noble Earl was a resident proprietor, taking the deepest interest in local undertakings calculated to improve the county and develop its resources.

— At Brighton, aged 63, John Haggard, LL.B. 1813, LL.D. 1818, Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and of Doctors' Commons, D.C.L., Chancellor of the Diocese of Manchester. Dr. Haggard was educated at Trinity Hall, Cambridge. He was appointed Chancellor of Lincoln by Bishop Kaye. In 1845 he was nominated Chancellor of the diocese of Winchester by the present Bishop, and in 1847 Commissary for Surrey in the same diocese. In the same year, 1847, he received the appointment of Chancellor of Manchester from the present and first Bishop of this diocese.

NOVEMBER.

1. At Calcutta, John Dunbar, esq., one of the Sudder Judges, second son of the late the Hon. Sir Archibald Dunbar, bart., of Northfield, Elgin.

— Suddenly, at his residence, 47, Eaton Square, the Right Hon. Sir John Jervis, Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas. The late Chief Justice served

for some time in the army before trying his fortune at the bar. Being induced to change his profession, he was called to the bar in the year 1824, went the Oxford and Chester circuits, and soon attracted attention by his ability. Becoming a Queen's Counsel, and his reputation still continuing, he was appointed Attorney-General in the year 1846, an office which he filled with great capacity in a very trying time. It was his duty to prosecute those misguided men, who, excited by the events on the Continent in 1848, attempted to disturb the quiet of these kingdoms. The moderation of the Government of the day, and the tact and good management of the Attorney-General, succeeded in vindicating the law, without raising any feelings of discontent towards the authorities, or misplaced sympathy towards the offenders. In 1850 he was raised to the Chief Justiceship of the Common Pleas, in succession to Lord Truro, who was raised to the Chancellorship. The common sense which Sir John Jervis possessed, in addition to his great professional experience, kept him clear of judicial blunders, and in criminal matters, which form so large a portion of judicial duties, an abler judge in all probability never sat on the bench. His sagacity and acuteness here found a fitting field, and his dexterity and sound practical sense stood him in good stead, whether in detecting crime or in exposing the fallacies put forward by counsel. In his purely legal decisions he showed the same qualities. As a judge he received the approbation of all Westminster Hall. In politics the late Chief Justice was a Whig and "something more." He sat for Chester from 1832 to 1850, and invariably supported the measures and views of the Whig party.

2. At Exe View, near Exmouth, aged 63, Lieut.-Col. the Hon. Robert Moore.

— From a fall from the rigging, on board the R. Y. S. schooner *Fancy*, cruising in the Mediterranean, aged 21, George Greenville Fortescue, esq., eldest son of the Hon. George and Lady Louisa Fortescue.

— At Brighton, Mrs. Swynfen Jervis, wife of Swynfen Jervis, of Darlaston Hall, near Stone, Staffordshire.

3. Aged 52, Prince Karl of Leiningen, half-brother of Her Majesty Queen Victoria. The prince was the only son of His Serene Highness Heinrich Charles, Prince of Leiningen, by his marriage with the Princess Victoria Marie-Louise, of Saxe-Coburg, who afterwards married H.R.H. the

Duke of Kent, and consequently stood in the position of half-brother to Her Majesty. He succeeded his father in his petty principality in 1814. When of age he entered the military service of the King of Bavaria, in whose army he held the rank of Lieutenant-General and Colonel-in-Chief of the 5th Regiment of cavalry. The prince married in February, 1829, Marie (*née*) Countess of Kletelsberg, by whom he leaves two sons. The deceased prince is succeeded by Prince Ernest, who is a lieutenant in the British navy, and distinguished himself during the recent naval operations in the Black Sea, and who is now serving with distinction in China.

4. At the residence of her father, Mount Pleasant Pagets, aged 50, Lady Fahie, relict of Vice-Adm. Sir William Charles Fahie, K.C.B.

— At Bricklehampton Hall, Pershore, Worcestershire, by a fall from his horse, Francis Woodward, esq., well known as an eminent agriculturist, and an active magistrate, and Deputy-Lieut. of that county.

— At Millmead House, Guilford, after a lingering illness, aged 55, Gen. W. J. Butterworth. He lately resigned his post as Governor of Prince of Wales' Island, Singapore, and Malacca, which he held from the year 1843 to 1855.

5. At Wollaton Hall, Notts, aged 87, the Right Hon. Digby, Lord Middleton. In early life Lord Middleton served in the royal navy, and was first lieutenant on board the *Culloden*, in Lord Howe's action off Ushant, on the 1st of June, 1794.

8. At Southernhay, near Exeter, Gen. Sir John Rolt, K.C.B., and K.H., colonel of the Queen's Royals. This distinguished officer entered the army in 1800, and served in the following year under the gallant Sir Ralph Abercromby in Egypt, where he was severely wounded, being shot through the body on the day that he landed there. He subsequently joined the British army in the Peninsula, and was present at Busaco, Ciudad Rodrigo, Badajoz, Vittoria, Nivelle, Nive, Orthes, and Toulouse, for which he had received a cross and one clasp. He commanded the 17th Portuguese Regiment from 1812 down to the close of the war. He was appointed to the colonelcy of the 2nd Regiment of Foot, or Queen's Own Royals, on the death of Lord Saltoun, in 1853, and in the following year attained the rank of lieutenant-general.

9. At Benaere Hall, Suffolk, aged 53, Sir Edward Sherlock Gooch, bart., M.P. Sir Edward, who has represented the Eastern Division of Suffolk on Conservative prin-

ciples during the last ten years, succeeded as 6th Baronet on the death of his father, Sir Thomas Sherlock Gooch, in 1851. The late Baronet, who was educated at Westminster, and formerly held a commission in the 14th Light Dragoons, was a Justice of the Peace and Deputy-Lieut. for Suffolk. In 1851 Sir Edward was installed Provincial-Grand-Master of the most ancient and honourable Order of Freemasons, which office he held to the time of his death.

10. At Ichkenneth, Argyleshire, aged 80, Lieut.-Col. Robert Macdonald, C.B., late Royal Horse Artillery.

11. At Craven Hill, Bayswater, Susan Emily, wife of Lieut.-Gen. Sir R. H. Cunliffe, bart., C.B.

— At Ennistymon, county of Clare, aged 80, Col. William Nugent Macnamara, formerly M.P. for the county of Clare. Colonel Macnamara was one of the most popular men of his day in the times immediately preceding the passing of the Catholic Relief Bill, and was O'Connell's "second" in his memorable duel with Mr. D'Esterre, in 1815. He represented the county of Clare in several Parliaments.

— At Clopton, aged 55, Catherine, widow of the late Col. Wake, of the Bengal Army, and only sister of John Bagshaw, esq., M.P., of Dover Court.

* 12. At Farnah, Derbyshire, the Right Hon. Nathaniel, Lord Scarsdale, aged 75.

— At his residence, Brompton, aged 75, the Rev. Thomas Bowdler, M.A., Secretary to the Incorporated Society for Building Churches. He was, together with Mr. Justice Alan Park, Mr. Davis, and Mr. Turner, mainly instrumental in founding the Church Building Society. His uncle, Mr. Thomas Bowdler, was the editor of the "Family Shakspeare," and "Gibbon." Thomas, the eldest son, was born March 13, 1780, and educated first at Hyde Abbey School, near Winchester, where he formed a friendship, which he retained through life, with Dr. Chandler, now Dean of Chichester. At St. John's College, Cambridge, he lived on terms of intimacy with the most eminent men of his day, including Sir Robert Grant, Lord Glenelg, Chancellor Raikes, and the Rev. J. W. Cunningham. Mr. Bowdler, in 1834, became the incumbent of the new district church at Sydenham. At this time he also held the chaplaincy of St. Katherine's Hospital, in the Regent's Park—an engagement which interested him so much, from that deep tone of sympathy which was a part of his character, that when he had some time after been obliged to relinquish

it, owing to the changes which the health of his family rendered necessary, he spoke of it, though with too much self-disparagement, "as the only employment for which he ever felt himself fit." A series of domestic afflictions induced Mr. Bowdler to leave Sydenham and settle in London in 1846, where he became Secretary to the Church Building Society, which office he held until his death, with an honorary prebend in St. Paul's, to which he was presented by Bishop Bloomfield. In this post Mr. Bowdler's exertions were incessant; nor did he fail in any of the exertions and sacrifices which mark the Christian character—he was indeed an exemplar of the virtues and resignation of a follower of Christ. Afflictions continued to visit the good man—his remaining daughters died—his wife, the faithful sharer of his joys and sorrows, and of his good works—died. When this last tie which bound him to this world was severed, he had done with life, and calmly and silently awaited death, gently yet firmly discountenancing all attempts to draw from him expressions of confidence, and saying, "I can but just creep to the foot of the cross." In losing Mr. Bowdler, the widow and the fatherless, the needy minister of the Gospel, the distressed tradesman, the old domestic, and many others, have lost a friend always ready to assist their wants.

15. At his seat, Harewood, near Calstock, Sir William L. Salusbury Trelawny, bart. The deceased, who was the eighth Baronet since its creation in 1628, succeeded to the Lord-Lieutenancy of the county of Cornwall on the demise of the late Earl Mount Edgcumbe; the eastern division of which county he represented in Parliament in 1832-7.

16. At Northgate, Totnes, aged 45, Caroline Frances, wife of Rear-Adm. Frederick Thomas Mitchell, C.B.

— At her residence, Sydenham, aged 74, Elizabeth, eldest surviving daughter of the late Francis Rivington, esq.

17. At Sonning Grove, Berks, aged 80, the Very Rev. Hugh Nicholas Pearsun, formerly Dean of Salisbury.

— At his residence, Clarges House, Ryde, in the Isle of Wight, in his 78th year, William Knyvett, esq., Composer to, and Gentleman of, Her Majesty's Chapels Royal, and one of the Lay Clerks of Westminster Abbey. Mr. W. Knyvett during a lengthened period, held the highest rank in his profession, as an accomplished musician, a teacher, and a vocal performer. He was born April 21, 1779, and initiated in

music by his father, Mr. Charles Knyvett, one of the Gentlemen and Organist of the Chapel Royal to George III., and continued his professional education under the justly-celebrated Samuel Webbe, the eminent glee composer. At an unusually early age Mr. W. Knyvett was chosen as one of the Gentlemen of the Chapels Royal, and in 1808 received the appointment of Composer to the same. Not long after, at the request of Dean Vincent, he entered the choir of Westminster Abbey as a Lay Clerk. During more than thirty years he was a principal singer at the Ancient Concerts, the Vocal Concerts, and all the provincial music meetings, at which he took the alto, or contra-tenor parts. In 1831 he became Conductor of the Ancient Concerts, and was thenceforward generally employed as conductor at all the great musical festivals. Mr. Knyvett was a pleasing composer, especially of glees, of which "There is a Bloom;" "The Boatie rows;" "The Bells of St. Michael's Tower;" "The Midge's Dance;" are well known. For three of his glees he gained silver cups as prizes, two of them presented to him in 1800 and 1802, by the hands of the Prince of Wales, who never ceased to be his steady patron. He left several unpublished compositions: of these, the grand anthems, "The King shall rejoice," produced officially for the coronation of George IV., and "This is the day which the Lord has made," written for the coronation of her present Majesty, were, as a matter of course, immediately transferred from Westminster Abbey to the provincial music meetings.

17. At the residence of W. E. Wooler, esq., of Durham, Colonel Gordon Drummond, of the Coldstream Guards. The gallant deceased was the son of Gen. Sir Gordon Drummond, G.C.B., who married the eldest daughter of W. Russell, esq., of Brancepeth Castle, Durham, aunt to the Viscountess Boyne.

— At Grosvenor Terrace, Belgrave Road, Pimlico, aged 64, Lieut.-Col. John Francis Power, Commanding Depôt of the British German Legion, Shorncliffe, late of the 35th Regiment, and formerly of the 3rd Hussars, King's German Legion. He fought at Copenhagen, Benavente, Cornnna, and Waterloo.

18. At Odessa, aged 74, Prince Woronzoff. Prince Michael Woronzoff was the son of Count Simeon Woronzoff, and was born at St. Petersburg, on the 17th of May, 1782. His father was appointed Ambassador to this country shortly after the late prince was born. When the Em-

peror Paul took part with Napoleon against us, the mission of Count Woronzoff as Ambassador was, of course, interrupted; but he continued to reside in London. Upon the accession of Alexander he resumed the embassy, and resided in London, with a few short intervals of absence, until his death in 1832. His son Michael thus received an English education, and became thoroughly identified with English society and habits of thought. His daughter married the late Earl of Pembroke, and became the mother of the Right Hon. Sidney Herbert, M.P. Michael Woronzoff, at the age of 19, entered the Russian army, served in the Caucasus, then in several campaigns against Napoleon from 1812 to 1814, and commanded a division at the battle of Borodino. He represented Russia at the Conference at Aix-la-Chapelle. In 1823 he was appointed Governor of New Russia, and continued to hold that office until the late war. He was engaged in the Turkish war of 1828, and held the command after Menschikoff had been wounded at Varna. In 1845 he was sent to subdue the Circassians, and although the brave mountaineers were able to resist even the immense forces at his command, he succeeded in the capture of Dargo, one of Schamyl's strongholds in the Caucasus, and was rewarded with a principedom. When the conflict between Russia and the allies broke out in 1853, he was permitted, at his own urgent request, to retire from office. Prince Woronzoff, although a true Russian patriot, has always been a great admirer of England, the country of his education; and he is understood to have been much opposed to the late war between Russia and England, believing that the two countries might long have pursued their glorious careers without clashing. Of his powers as an administrator, a very favourable picture has been given. "Since his assumption of the reins of government in the Caucasus," says Mr. Seymour, "the whole aspect of the country has changed. Towns have been built, roads made, speculation checked, honourable feelings stimulated in the officers, and the condition of the private soldier greatly improved. The natives have been raised to a level with the Russians, and all have been alike treated with respect and urbanity. He displayed administrative abilities of the highest order, and possessed the rare quality of securing the affection and raising the tone of all around him."

21. At 10, Kensington Palace Gardens, aged 56, James Meadows Rendel, esq.,

DEATHS.—Nov.

F.R.S., C.E. The late Mr. J. M. Rendel was a native of the West of England. He was early selected by that acute observer of talent, Mr. Telford, for laying out and constructing considerable lengths of turnpike roads in Devonshire and Cornwall; and the difficulties he there encountered and overcame tended much to give him that self-reliance so useful to him in his subsequent career. After being engaged in several large works in his native district, he undertook the construction of the cast-iron bridge over the river Lary, near Plymouth; and to his exclusive direction, with the approval of Mr. Telford, was entrusted the execution of that important work. This was soon followed by the construction of the floating steam-bridge for crossing the estuary of the Dart, near Dartmouth, somewhat on the same principle as those subsequently established by him for crossing the Hamoaze, and those at Saltash, at Southampton, and at Portsmouth. He was engaged also in the distribution of the water-mains at H.M. Dockyard, Plymouth, and on the waterworks at Edinburgh. In the year 1838 he removed from Plymouth to London, and soon became extensively occupied on important works, and was engaged in the Parliamentary contest of that remarkable period in the history of engineering. Among the numerous works upon which he was occupied may be mentioned the Montrose Suspension Bridge; the Inverness Bridge, and the Leith and East and West India and London Docks, where he designed and executed extensive improvements, amounting to partial reconstruction. The design for the construction of docks at Birkenhead, in Cheshire, of such an extent as to create a formidable rival to Liverpool, brought Mr. Rendel very prominently before the world. The daring project of constructing a dock at Great Grimsby, by projecting the works far out upon the mud-banks of the river Humber, was next successfully accomplished; and he commenced the two great works which alone suffice to hand down his name to posterity, besides those of Smeaton, Rennie, and Telford,—the harbours of refuge of Holyhead and Portland. Both these works were conceived with the largest views, and have been carried on with great rapidity. In both cases the system was adopted of establishing timber stages over the line of the jetties, and depositing the masses of stone, of all dimensions, by dropping them vertically from railway waggons into their positions; thus bringing up the mass simultaneously to above the level of the sea. In this

manner, as much as 24,000 tons of stone have been deposited in one week; and to supply this vast demand, monster blasts of five or six tons of gunpowder were frequently employed. Among the other works upon which Mr. Rendel was engaged, should also be mentioned the constructions on the river Lea, and the improvements on the Nene River; the latter a work of considerable difficulty. He was also employed by the Exchequer Loan Commissioners to report upon the drainage and other public works in Ireland. He was less engaged in railways than in hydraulic works; but in England he executed the Birkenhead, Lancashire, and Cheshire Junction Line, and in India he had the direction of the East Indian and Madras Railways; the former projected by Mr. Macdonald Stephenson, as the first of the vast system now being formed, and which will probably work a revolution in the destiny of the Indian Empire. The Ceylon and the Pernambuco lines were also under his charge. Mr. Rendel was very frequently called upon by the Government to report on large works—the most implicit confidence being reposed in his truthfulness, the correctness of his views, and the fearless expression of his opinions. He was a man of great energy, clear perception, and correct judgment; his practical knowledge was well directed, and he knew how to make good use of the scientific acquirements and skill of all whose services he engaged. Mr. Rendel was a Fellow of the Royal Society, and was elected upon the council; he was a very early member of the Institution of Civil Engineers, having joined it in 1824. He had been for the last sixteen years upon the council, and was President during the years 1852 and 1853.

21. At Genoa, the Rev. William Wellwood Stoddart, late Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, Vicar of Charlbury (1853), Oxfordshire.

22. At Woolwich, aged 71, Emma Lady Frazer, widow of Sir Augustus Simon Frazer, (R.H.A.) K.C.B.

— At his seat, Salruc House, situate on the Little Killeries, Ireland, Lieut.-Gen. Alexander Thompson, Col.-in-Chief of the 74th Highlanders now in India. General Thompson was at Busaco, the retreat to Torres Vedras, Fuentes d'Onor (wounded), Ciudad Rodrigo, for which he was made a Brevet-Major. At Badajoz he was also wounded while leading one of the storming parties of 300 men. He also shared in the victories of Salamanca, Vittoria, St. Sebastian, Nivelle, Orthes, and various

skirmishes, for which he had a gold medal, and the silver war-medal with nine clasps.

23. At her house, Bath, aged 82, Julia Anne, Countess Dowager of Roden.

— At Flixton Hall, Suffolk, Sarah, relict of the Rev. Townley Clarkson.

— At West Retford, the Rev. Henry Dickonson, of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, and rector of West Retford, Nottinghamshire. The Rev. Henry Dickonson was the last of a family of considerable wealth in Notts. In 1818 he married Miss Wynn, the daughter of a wealthy bookseller in London, by whom he acquired a handsome fortune. In November, 1836, he succeeded to the living of West Retford. From thenceforward Mr. Dickonson and his wife lived a most eccentric and penurious life—his windows had not been cleaned or opened for years, and the bedding and furniture was rotting from age and mildew. Some of the rooms were filled with cases of good furniture that had never been unpacked. No fire had ever been lighted in the kitchen grate. Mr. Dickonson had not been seen for some days, and when his parishioners, with much difficulty, got admittance, the reverend gentleman was found dying from continued deprivation. His property amounted to between 40,000*l.* and 50,000*l.*, the whole of which he has left to his wife.

24. Aged 80, Margaret, relict of the Rev. W. Atherton, and mother of W. Atherton, esq., M.P.

25. At Denmark Hill, aged 34, Mr. Angus B. Reach. This gentleman was one of the most indefatigable of the professional writers of the day. He was well known as the dramatic and musical critic of the *Morning Chronicle*, and as the author of two novels, "Leonard Lindsay," and "Clement Lorimer," of a pleasant volume of sketches of French scenery and manners, entitled "Claret and Olives, or the Garonne and the Rhone," and of the once so popular "Natural History of the Bores," "Natural History of Humbugs," and "Romance of a Mince Pie." He also wrote an immense number of magazine papers, and contributed many leaders to the *Morning Chronicle*, and a weekly letter of political gossip to the *Inverness Courier*. The incessant strain upon the brain necessary to a professional *litterateur* had its revenge, for the unfortunate gentleman had been utterly disabled for two years by paralysis. Mr. Reach's talents and good qualities had greatly endeared him to his associates, and some of those amateur performances, which are among the most

charming social amusements of the day, were given for his benefit.

25. At Milton-Lockhart, after a short illness, William Lockhart, esq., of Milton-Lockhart, M.P. for the county of Lanark. Mr. Lockhart had represented his native county of Lanark since 1841, being returned to Parliament each time without opposition. He was Dean of Faculty of the University of Glasgow, and Lieutenant-Colonel-Commandant of the Lanarkshire Regiment of Yeomanry Cavalry. His next brother was John Gibson Lockhart, the editor of the *Quarterly Review*, and son-in-law of Sir Walter Scott. As Mr. William Lockhart has died childless, he will be succeeded in his estates by the family of Mr. Hope Scott, the husband of Mr. J. G. Lockhart's only child, who is the daughter of the great Minstrel's eldest daughter, Sophia Scott.

26. At Vienna, aged 82, M. Hammer Purgstall, a celebrated Oriental scholar. Baron von Hammer was born in 1774, at Gratz, in Styria, where his father occupied an honourable position in the public service. From his earliest childhood, a mysterious influence seemed to draw him towards the East, and he entered as a pupil in the Oriental Academy, at Vienna, where he speedily distinguished himself. In 1799 he was sent as dragoman to Constantinople, whence he was transferred to Egypt, and employed as interpreter to the English army in Abercrombie's campaign. He was subsequently *attaché* to the Austrian Embassy at Constantinople, and consul in Moldavia. In 1811 he became interpreter to the Vienna Chancery. In 1817 he was made a councillor, and in 1835 a baron. Of late years, he had retired from the public service, and lived on his estates in Styria. He published numerous works on Oriental history, literature, and on philology. Baron Hammer was ex-President and senior member of the Vienna Academy of Science, and is said to have won the decorations of twenty different orders, and to have been a member of almost every literary society in the world. His remains were borne to the grave by the students of the Oriental Academy.

— At Batcombe, Somersetshire, aged 82, John Wickham, esq., one of H.M.'s Justices of the Peace, and Deputy-Lieut. of Somersetshire.

28. At Liverpool, Captain Dani. His life has been one of intense interest, he having been in nearly every country on the globe, from the ice-bound coast of the Arctic regions, to the scorching plains of

DEATHS.—Nov.

Central Africa. He was a native of Pisa, in Tuscany; left home at the age of ten years to go on board a British-man-of-war, and remained in the service until the year 1806; served under Sir John Jervis and Lord Nelson; was present at Aboukir, St. Vincent, and Copenhagen, when he held the candle for Admiral Nelson on his sealing his celebrated letter (?). He afterwards engaged in the service of the City of Dublin Steam-Packet Company. He received a gold medal for meritorious services in connection with the *Ocean Monarch*, as also for his previous naval engagements.

28. At Upper Grosvenor Street, aged 85, Gen. Sir Henry John Cuming, K.C.H., Col. of the 12th Royal Lancers.

29. At his residence, Westbourne Crescent, Hyde Park, Rear-Admiral Frederick William Beechey, F.R.S., President of the Royal Geographical Society, &c., aged 60. The name of Admiral Beechey will be ever memorable among that band of distinguished officers of the British navy who have so remarkably united scientific to professional acquirements, and gained renown in times of peace by services as perilous and as honourable as those of warfare. He was born in 1796, the son of the well-known painter, Sir William Beechey, R.A., and entered the navy in his tenth year, under the immediate charge of Earl St. Vincent, and served under Sir Sidney Smith. In 1811, while serving in the *Astræa*, 42, under Captain Schomberg, in company with the *Phœbe*, *Galatea*, and *Racehorse*, he assisted at the capture of the French frigates *Renommée*, *Clorinde*, and *Nereide*. On his return to England, after some service in the Channel, he was appointed to the *Vengeur*, 74, forming part of the expedition to New Orleans, where he served in the boats which crossed the Mississippi with a detachment of troops, seamen, and marines, to make a diversion in favour of the general attack upon the American lines. March 10th, 1815, was the date of his first commission, and in September of that year he was appointed to the *Niger*, 38, on the North-American station. This was his last war service. The return of peace called him to new enterprises. In January, 1818, he was appointed to the *Trent*, under Lieutenant and Commander Franklin, and departed on the first of four arctic voyages in which he took part. It was then that a friendship commenced with Franklin, which was retained through life, and to which touching allusion was made in the address this year delivered by him

from the chair of the Royal Geographical Society. An interesting account of the voyage of the *Trent* and the *Dorothea*, Captain Buchan (the senior officer of the expedition), was published by Beechey in 1843. In 1819 he was appointed to the *Hecla*, under the command of Lieutenant, afterwards Sir Edward, Parry, and rendered useful service during that memorable expedition. On the 5th November, 1821, Lieutenant Beechey was appointed to the *Adventure*, under Captain (now Admiral) W. H. Smyth, the veteran hydrographer, then engaged in the survey of the northern coast of Africa. While on this service, Beechey, promoted to the rank of Commander, was detached, along with his brother, H. W. Beechey, esq., to explore the classic region of the old Greek Pentapolis, and especially to examine and report on the antiquities of the Cyrenaica. His narrative of the expedition, and description of the country and its antiquities, were published in 1828. In 1825 Commander Beechey was appointed to the *Blossom*, 24, in which ship he performed the voyages with which his name will be chiefly signalized in the annals of British enterprize and navigation. In the light of the subsequent history of arctic discovery, it is now interesting to recall the objects and aspirations of other days, as they are expressed in Beechey's introductory remarks, echoing the Admiralty instructions under which he sailed in the *Blossom*:—"In 1824, his late Majesty having commanded that another attempt (to discover a north-west passage to the Pacific) should be made by way of Prince Regent's Inlet, an expedition was equipped,—the last that sailed on this interesting service—and the command was again conferred upon Captain Parry, whose exploits have so deservedly earned for him the approbation of his country. At the same time, Captain Franklin, undaunted by his former perilous expedition, and by the magnitude of the contemplated undertaking, having, with the promptness, and perseverance peculiar to his character, proposed to connect his brilliant discoveries at the mouth of the Copper-mine River with the furthest known point on the western side of America, by descending the Mackenzie River, and with the assistance of his intrepid associate, Dr. Richardson, by coasting the northern shore in opposite directions towards the two previously-discovered points, his late Majesty was also pleased to command that this expedition should be simultaneously undertaken. From the nature of these services, it was nearly im-

possible that either of these expeditions should arrive at the open sea in Behring's Straits without having nearly, if not wholly, exhausted their resources, Captain Franklin's party being in addition destitute of a conveyance to a place whence it could return to Europe. To obviate these anticipated difficulties, His Majesty's Government determined upon sending a ship to Behring's Straits to await the arrival of the two expeditions." Such was the immediate object of the voyage of the *Blossom*; but as a considerable period must elapse before her presence would be required in the north, and the time of the arrival of the arctic voyagers was uncertain, it was resolved to employ him in surveying such parts of the Pacific as were within his reach, or were of most consequence to navigation. The results of this voyage, which extended over three years, are well known in the history of geographical enterprise and of physical science. The "Narrative" was published in 1831, in two volumes quarto, by authority of the Admiralty. In looking over the Narrative, we meet with many notices of places which will be read with strange interest from the events which they subsequently witnessed. At San Francisco, for instance, then a Spanish town, the chief object of curiosity was the Californian mode of throwing the lasso; and a spirited picture of a bull-fight illustrates the chapter. The visit to Otaheite and other now familiar islands, and the discovery of the new groups named after Melville, Croker, and other Admiralty authorities of the day; the visit to Pitcairn Island, and the interview with Adams, the last survivor of the mutineers of the *Bounty*, whose descendants have lately migrated to Norfolk Island; the Chinese coast explorations; and the accounts of other places now better known to Western Europe, will arrest the attention of the reader, and suggest reflections on the subsequent history of these parts of the world. Beechey returned to England in 1828, after a voyage of upwards of 70,000 miles, and an absence of three years, passed both in arctic and tropical climates, during which he rendered important services to science and to navigation. The narrative was published in two quarto volumes, and in two separate volumes the Botany and Zoology of the expedition. In 1835 he was appointed to the *Sulphur*, for the purpose of continuing the survey of the Pacific, but failure of health compelled him to return soon after reaching the South American coast. From 1837 to 1847 Captain

Beechey was engaged in the survey of the Bristol and Irish Channels, and to his labours is mainly due the formation of the accurate charts of these seas which we now possess. He also carried on a series of tidal observations, which were continued down to last year, and which, besides their value as a contribution to science, have proved of infinite service to the navigation of our own coasts. In 1847 Captain Beechey was empowered by the Government to constitute and superintend the Marine Department of the Board of Trade, a service in which he was actively and usefully employed till the day of his death. He was promoted to the rank of Rear-Admiral in 1854, and in the following year was elected to the office of President of the Royal Geographical Society.

Lately. At a recent meeting of the Liverpool Town Council, a vote of condolence was moved to the widow of the late R. V. Yates, esq., a merchant and magistrate of the borough, recently deceased. In seconding the vote of condolence, Mr. John Stewart, the late Mayor, said that when the idea of a public park for Liverpool was first mooted, Mr. Yates offered to give 5,000*l.* towards it; and when the scheme fell through, he purchased 100 acres of land, now known as the Prince's Park, for 50,000*l.*, which park is free to the public for seventy-five years, Mr. Yates' estate being also charged with the payment of 1,000*l.* per annum to keep it in repair, till such time as the property adjacent to the Park may be sold to defray the charge.

Lately. At his residence, 'Northlands, County Cavan, the Very Rev. Samuel Adams, M.A., Dean of Cashel.

Lately. At Mouriac, in France, of typhus fever, aged 21, John Arthur Herbert, son of the Royal Academician. He was the painter of "Philip IV. of Spain knighting Velasquez," one of the most admired pictures in the exhibition at the National Gallery this year, and one which, by its genuine feeling and historic truth, attracted the special commendation of Her Majesty and Prince Albert, who highly complimented Mr. Herbert on his son's success and promise of future distinction. Mr. Herbert had been educated at Oscott College, under Dr. Wiseman, and, after leaving school, had studied painting under his father, with whom he had spent two years and a half in France.

Lately. At Connemara, aged 70, Shawn Nabontree, one of the last of the mythical line of "Irish Giants." He owed his

DEATHS.—DEC.

sobriquet to his unusual stature, being a man of extraordinary athletic symmetry—namely, seven feet in height, and weighing over 20 stone. His family, the Joyces, has been for many years one of the wonders of Connemara.

Lately. At Dunbrooke, parish of Hollywood, county of Wicklow, at the advanced age of 113 years, Mr. Michael Legro. He retained full possession of all his faculties to the last moment; and at an investigation lately held by order of the Court of Chancery in England, concerning the next of kin, which involved the disposal of many thousand pounds, his evidence, which he gave in the most clear and satisfactory manner, was most important.

Lately. Suddenly, aged 40, Chas. Montgomerie, only son of Sir Charles M. Lamb, bart., of Beauport, Sussex.

DECEMBER.

2. At Blackwater, Georgetown, Cape of Good Hope, aged 57, Major Henry Douglas Warden, of the Cape Mounted Rifles, and late British Resident of the Orange River Sovereignty.

— Suddenly, at his residence in Beaumont Street, Oxford, the Rev. Robert Hussey, Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford. Mr. Hussey was a King's Scholar at Westminster, and was elected student of Christ Church in 1821, and took a double first-class in Michaelmas Term, 1824. His high reputation for scholarship caused the late Dean Gaisford to select him to edit an edition of the *Odyssey*, which has great reputation. In 1837 he was appointed one of the Public Examiners in the Classical Schools. In 1842 he was appointed by the Crown Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History. During his life of industrious and useful study Professor Hussey published a considerable number of works on classical subjects; nor was he less learned on subjects of antiquarian research, particularly on local antiquities. He took besides a very useful part in the affairs of the University, in which he enjoyed the esteem and veneration of all ranks.

3. Killed, at Canton, whilst discharging his professional duties, Wm. Cowper, esq., Capt., commanding Royal Engineers, eldest son of the late Lieut.-Col. Cowper, Hon. East India Company's Bombay Engineers.

5. At his official residence in Greenwich Hospital, aged 68, Lieutenant William Rivers, an officer largely known and highly

respected. He went to sea at a very early age, under the care of his father, in the time-honoured "Victory," and until after the battle of Trafalgar, never served in any other ship. He was present in this ship at Lord Hotham's second action in 1795, and was slightly wounded; he was also in the action off Cape St. Vincent, and in the crowning battle of Trafalgar lost his left leg—being wounded as the ship was running into action, and elicited from Nelson, with whom he was a great favourite, the tenderest sympathy. "Take care of young Rivers, Hardy," were the hero's words. But a short time afterwards and Nelson himself was brought down into the cock-pit mortally wounded. The one-legged Lieutenant, whose personal and mental activity were seldom surpassed, rigidly followed up his profession. He was a Lieutenant of the "Cossack" at Copenhagen in 1807, and First Lieutenant of the "Cretan" at Flushing in 1809; and continued for a considerable period actively employed in the Channel and on the north coast of Spain. The peace for a time laid this gallant son of Neptune on the shelf, from which he was removed to Woolwich Dockyard, and from thence, in 1826, to Greenwich Hospital.

7. At Truro, aged 105, Elizabeth, widow of Capt. Curgenvin, R.N., sister of the late Rev. J. Pomery, Vicar of St. Kew. Mrs. Curgenvin was born many years before the end of the reign of King George II. Her husband, Capt. Richard Curgenvin, R.N., obtained his rank of post-captain for his services in Lord Rodney's celebrated action with Admiral De Grasse in 1782.

— At Paris, Lieut.-Gen. the Hon. Henry Edward Butler, second son of the second Earl of Carrick, and uncle of the present peer. He served in the Egyptian campaign and the Peninsular war. This gallant veteran was colonel of the 55th Foot, but better known as the father of the three heroes who fell in their country's service within a space of six months. His eldest son, Henry Thomas, captain 55th Foot, was Deputy-assistant-adjutant-general in the Crimean expedition, and was killed at Inkermann. His second son, Charles George, captain in the 86th Foot, died in India Dec. 1854, aged 31. His fourth son, James Armar, captain in the Ceylon Rifles, was the hero of Silistria, but did not live to receive the honours which awaited his colleague, Lieutenant (now Major) Nasmyth, in England, for the gallant and successful defence of that fortress. He died from fatigue and sickness in July, 1854, aged 27.

7. At Baltimore, U.S., suddenly, aged 52, Henry George Kuper, esq., British Consul at that city, eldest son of the Rev. William Kuper, D.D., K.H., Chaplain to the Royal German Chapel; after upwards of 30 years passed in Her Majesty's service.

8. At his lodgings, Queenstown, Ireland, aged 66, the Rev. Theobald Mathew, the well-known Apostle of Temperance. Theobald Mathew was descended from the great Welsh and Irish family of the same name, who were so long seated at Thomastown, and had the title of Earl of Llandaff, but which is now extinct. The rev. gentleman was educated at Maynooth, and having received due ordination as a Roman Catholic priest, was appointed to the ministry at Cork. In his dealing he proved himself a truly Christian priest, pious, fearless, diligent, self-sacrificing. It is well-known that drunkenness was one of the vices of that time. Bad as it was in England, in Ireland it was a frightful curse—the source of infinite poverty and misery, and at the root of all the crimes that disgraced that unhappy island. The tax placed by Government on spirits not only failed to check the evil, but even aggravated it, for it produced the greater curse of illicit stills, whose whiskey was of course far cheaper and most deleterious, and the indulgence had the charm of mystery and defiance of law. The evil was thought hopeless and incurable, and it was said that the Irish would abandon their nature before they abandoned their whiskey. Under these circumstances some wise and good men formed a “Temperance Association.” Father Mathew became an enthusiastic preacher in the cause, with what success, ultimately, is well known. The work, however, was not the work of a day. For a year and a half he toiled and laboured against the deep-rooted degradation of the “boys” of Cork, the ridicule and detraction of many doubtful friends, and the discountenance of many others from whom he had expected support. He held his regular meetings twice a week in the Horse Bazaar. At length he had the satisfaction of seeing the mighty mass of obdurate indifference begin to move. He continued to apply the lever, and the motion increased: some of the most obdurate drunkards in Cork enrolled their names in his “Total Abstinence Association.” The first great outbreak was at Limerick, where Father Mathew had engaged to preach at the request of the bishop; and the mayor of which city declared that within ten months no less than one hundred and fifty

inquests had been held in the county, one-half of which were on persons whose deaths had been occasioned by intoxication. As soon as the country people heard that Father Mathew was in Limerick, they rushed into the city in thousands. So great was the crush, that, though no violence was used, the iron rails which surrounded the residence of the “Apostle of Temperance” were torn down, and some scores of people precipitated into the Shannon. It is said that some of the Scots-Greys, who attended to keep order in the streets, were actually lifted from the ground; and so densely were the people thronged, that several, in their eagerness to touch the hem of Father Mathew's garment, ran along on the heads and shoulders of the vast crowd. At Parsontown, order was only maintained by a body of the Rifles, with their bayonets fixed and pointed, so as to form a barrier to the rushing multitudes in front of the chapel in which, in strong contrast to the striking scene without, sat the mild and unassuming man who had collected this display of numerical force, and had marshalled this peaceful army. It is unnecessary to follow Father Mathew in his temperance progresses. Some idea of their results may be formed when it is stated that at Nenagh 20,000 persons are said to have taken the pledge in one day; 100,000 at Galway in two days; in Loughrea, 80,000 in two days; between that and Portumna, from 180,000 to 200,000; and in Dublin, about 70,000 during five days. There are few towns in Ireland which Father Mathew did not visit with like success. In 1844 he visited Liverpool, Manchester, and London; and the enthusiasm with which he was received there, and in other English cities, testified equally to the need and to the progress of the remedy. Beyond question the great temperance movement must have produced permanent beneficial effect; but the wild enthusiasm of the Irish subsided as rapidly as it had risen, and in some places the re-action increased the evil. Father Mathew had thrown his own fortunes and those of his family into the movement. His own small property and large sums drawn from his relatives and friends were absorbed. A brother, who had a large distillery in the south of Ireland, was ruined by the crusade against ardent spirits. In short, Father Mathew appears to have reduced himself and his family to ruin, in his efforts, to ameliorate the condition of his countrymen. A few years since Her Majesty granted to “the Apostle of Tempe-

DEATHS.—DEC.

rance" an annuity of 300*l.* a year, but it is said that even this was absorbed in payments for the benefit of his creditors.

9. At Queen Anne Street, Cavendish Square, aged 69, Major-General Sir Archibald Chalmer, R.A.

— In the Persian Gulf, from wounds received the same day in storming the fort of Bushire, aged 24, Lieut. M. Corsellis Utterson, 20th Regiment B.N.I., second son of the late Rev. A. G. Utterson, Rector of Layer Marney, Essex.

— In action, near Bushire, Lieut.-Col. George Grenville Malet, commanding 3rd Light Cavalry, fourth son of the late Sir Charles Warre Malet, bart.

— At his residence, 9, Berkeley Square, Lieut.-Gen. Francis Miles Milman, Colonel of the 82nd Foot. General Milman, who was brother of the present baronet, and of the very Rev. Henry Hart Milman, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's, the distinguished scholar, poet, and reviewer, entered the British army in 1800. He was Aide-de-camp to Major-General C. Crawford in 1808; was present at the battles of Roleia and Vimiera; was on General Crawford's staff on the retreat of Sir John Moore, and was engaged on the heights of Lugo, and at Corunna. Subsequently joining his regiment at Lisbon, he was at the passage of the Douro, and at the capture of Oporto, and was severely wounded at Talavera, being only saved from being burnt on the field of battle by a private soldier of the Coldstreams. He was a prisoner at the hospital of Talavera, and was detained in France till 1814. The gallant General had the war-medal with four clasps, and was made Colonel of the 82nd Foot in 1850. General Milman married, March 8, 1817, Maria Margareta, eldest daughter of Sir Charles Morgan, bart., of Tredegar, and has left issue.

— At Sligo, at her son's, Dr. Archibald Armstrong, aged 100, Eleanor, relict of Dr. William Armstrong, of that town.

10. Aged 76, Mr. George Lindsay, an eminent Russian merchant, and Chairman of the Russia Company, suddenly at a meeting of the Board in the South Sea House. He was on the point of taking the chair, when he fell forward and instantly expired.

— At Welbury, near Northallerton, aged 110 (?) Jane, widow of Captain John Garbutt, R.N. For some years she has been maintained by the parish of Welbury, having her own cottage and a female attendant. The old woman had dwindled into a small compass, but she was free from

pain, retaining all her faculties to the last.

10. At Bushire, from wounds received the previous day, aged 24, Lieut. William Blackburn Warren, 20th [Bombay N.I., second son of the late Lieut. Dawson Warren, Royal Artillery.

11. In London, aged 42, William Frederick Lewis, esq., one of the Puisne Judges of the Supreme Court of Jamaica, second son of the late James Lewis, esq., Commissioner of Slave Compensation.

— At his shooting quarters, at Lockfineside, Charles Lamb, esq., half-brother of the Earl of Eglinton. Mr. Lamb died from the effects of injuries received by the bursting of a shell, while he was serving as a volunteer before Sebastopol.

— At Chiavari, near Genoa, the Dowager Countess of Donoughmore, second wife of the Right Hon. John Hely Hutchinson, third Earl of Donoughmore, who died in September, 1851; daughter of the late Lieut. Col. William Reynell, of Castle Reynell, Westmeath.

12. At Osborne Villa, Torquay, aged 71, Mr. Sergeant Thompson, son of the late T. Thompson, esq., M.P., banker, of Hull.

— The Lord Almaric Athelstan Spencer Churchill, son of his Grace the Duke of Marlborough, by the second Duchess.

15. At Sheerness, aged 74, Anne, widow of Colonel Francis Key, R.A.

— At Brighton, Hamilton Hamilton, esq., for many years H.M.'s Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at the Court of the Brazils.

16. At York Gate, Regent's Park, John Barrett Lennard, esq., Chief Clerk of H.M. Privy Council Office, second son of Sir Thomas Barrett Lennard, bart.

— In Paris, aged 48, the Hon. Gilbert Stapleton, of Ditton Hall, Lancashire, eldest surviving brother of the last and uncle of the present Lord Beaumont.

— At Barbreck House, Craginish, Argyleshire, aged 77, Rear-Admiral Donald Campbell, of Barbreck.

18. At Grafton Street, Fitzroy Place, Mary Ann Burnett, sister of the late Gilbert Burnett, Professor of Botany: he was the last male descendant of Bishop Burnett.

— At Leadenham, Lincoln, aged 24, the Right Hon. Lady Jane Sherrard, fourth daughter of the late Philip, Earl of Harborough, and sister of the present earl.

19. At Canaan House, Edinburgh, aged 77, the most noble John Douglas, sixth Marquis and Earl of Queensberry, Viscount Drumlanrig, and Baron Douglas of Hawick

and Tibbers, in the peerage of Scotland, and a Baronet of Nova Scotia, third son of Sir William Douglas, fifth Baronet of Kilhead, descended from William, first Earl of Queensberg. The Marquess married, the 16th July, 1817, his cousin, Sarah, third daughter of Major James Sholto Douglas, and leaves issue.

21. At the College, St. John's Wood, the Rev. John Harris, D.D., Principal of New College, London, aged 54. Dr. Harris, who was educated at the Independent College at Hoxton, was first settled as minister of a small congregational church at Epsom, where he continued for many years in comparative seclusion and obscurity; but was brought into public notice by being the successful competitor for a prize of a hundred guineas, offered by Dr. Conquest, for the best essay against covetousness. This production, under the title of "Mammon," gained extraordinary popularity, and drew the attention of the religious world towards the author. His services as a preacher were in great request, and were highly valued for their solid sense. In 1837 he became Professor of Theology in Cheshunt College; and when, in 1850, the various Independent colleges in and about the metropolis were consolidated into one, under the designation of New College, he was invited to preside over the institution.

— In Dublin, aged 68, Rear-Admiral F. Augustus Wetherall, of Ealing, Middlesex.

22. At Ewell Castle, very suddenly, James Gadesden, esq., late High Sheriff of the county of Surrey.

24. At Edinburgh, aged 54, Mr. Hugh Miller, an eminent geologist. This gentleman was another example of the genius that lies hidden within a peasant's brain. He was born at Cromarty, a small fishing port, one of a rough fishing and sea-faring family. His father was drowned in a storm, and his mother reduced to earn a scanty maintenance as a sempstress. Hugh, a bare-legged, half-wild boy, was sent to the grammar school, which is said to have been even more deficient in good instruction than its fellows. This, however, could hardly be, for it must have been here that the half-starved lad formed a solid foundation of learning. His first employment in life was as a quarry-man. This miserable occupation became to a true genius a source of knowledge—unconsciously the rough workman was learning geology. Quitting this employment, Hugh Miller went to Edinburgh, and attempted an ambitious rise in life—he aspired to be a

stonemason. At first he had to encounter all the rough usage of an unknown world. It does not appear how, but it is quite clear that he exhibited more than usual talent and industry, for he seems to have acquired a superior position. He must have read and studied hard, and with good effect; for leaving Edinburgh, and setting up in his native town as a mason, he published a volume of "Poems by a Stonemason," and became a regular writer in the *Inverness Courier*. These writings were especially remarkable for their force and excellence of composition. It would appear that while Miller was pursuing his occupation of a stone-mason, he also acted as a scientific guide to visitors of that romantic coast, and came to be considered an excellent geologist. One of the ladies, whom he had thus conducted through the wonders of the rocks, saw the real genius and sterling worth that lay beneath the rough exterior, and married the geologist; their union was attended with all the happiness which can proceed from noble natures. Mr. Miller now quitted masonry, and became a clerk in a banking establishment at Cromarty, in which he continued six years, writing and studying in his leisure hours. In 1840 a new change came over Hugh Miller's life. He had always taken a prominent part in local politics, and had been a member of the Town Council of Cromarty—an office not exposed to much temptation, for the corporate funds were so small, that an official letter having once arrived by post, the worshipful councillors could only arrive at its contents by subscribing among themselves the nine pence required to satisfy the inexorable postmaster. About this time the great schism had arisen in the Scotch church on the Intrusionist question, which terminated in the remarkable secession of the Free Church. Mr. Miller was a very warm non-intrusionist, and both spoke and wrote on the exciting topic. In 1840 he was appointed editor of "The Witness," the organ of the non-intrusionists, of which he afterwards became the proprietor. In the freedom afforded by the nature of his employment Hugh Miller became an ardent and systematic student of geology—always his favourite pursuit, and now his passion.—He then published his great work "The Old Red Sandstone; or, A New Walk in an Old Field," which stamped him with high and world-wide reputation. His subsequent publications, "The First Impressions of England and its People," "Footprints of the

Creator," (in reply to the "Vestiges of Creation,") and, "My Schools and Schoolmasters"—an autobiography of singular interest and value—are too well known to require any detailed description or panegyric. The melancholy close of the life of this self-taught genius and very estimable man will be best told in language of his own countrymen. "In all Mr. Miller's works there is a marked individuality of character. A strong family likeness pervades the whole of the series. Whatever be his subject, his personal feelings and experience enter largely into the composition; and though this peculiarity induces frequent digressions, and often leads to remote and unexpected illustrations, the interest of the reader is rarely suffered to flag, because the author appears before us in native truth and originality, and is a master of description. We follow him with curiosity and delight through the windings and recesses of his solitary walks by the sea-side; his early reading and reflection, even in the mason's *botoy*; and his studies in natural history, among the rocks and caves of the Moray Frith. It is a great thing in these days to get an original and true man, who puts his mind fairly to the mind of his reader, and wears no mask. And Hugh Miller was this in all his writings. He conceived that there were few of the natural sciences that did not lie as open to the working men of Britain and America as geology did to himself. The best schools are the schools of nature, free to all; and so he entered upon his teaching, not with didactic formality, but by telling, as Rousseau professed to do in his 'Confessions,' what he had done, what he had thought, and what he had been. Few men have combined in the same proportion the habit of patient investigation and analysis, and the talent for popular and picturesque writing. Sir Humphrey Davy is the only instance among modern authors of a scientific cast; but perhaps Goldsmith would, in many respects, be a better parallel. In the art of unfolding and embellishing the truths of science—clothing the anatomy of nature with graceful drapery—Miller wanted only a little condensation and a keener taste to rival Goldsmith; while, in extent of knowledge and comprehension in at least one science, and a depth of moral feeling and justness of thinking, he must rank with the first intellects of the age. He taught this great lesson to his fellow-men, that 'life itself is a school, and Nature always a fresh study; and that the man who keeps his eyes and his mind

open will always find fitting, though it may be hard, schoolmasters to speed him on his life-long education.' His death no less eloquently proclaims this truth, that even knowledge must not be pursued too ardently and unremittingly; that the brain, like the bodily functions, must not be overtasked, and that to disregard the laws of nature is to induce irretrievable calamity and ruin. He had now become famous and prosperous, was surrounded by wife, children, and friends, and dwelt at Portobello, near Edinburgh, in a large sea-side mansion which he had purchased, adding to it a museum and other fruits of cultivated taste and successful study. The destroyer entered in the familiar and unsuspected form of literary ambition. Mr. Miller had for some time been engaged on a work called 'The Testimony of the Rocks.' There appears to have been no call for immediate publication, or undue haste; but he laboured at his task night and day, seldom leaving the house or taking exercise. His health had previously been shattered by attacks of severe illness, presenting indications of mental disease, and this new toil aggravated all the previous symptoms. Fits of somnambulism, to which he had been subject in his youth, returned, and he got little refreshing sleep. He imagined himself and his museum to be in danger from robbers; and, having for many years carried a pistol on his person, he now added a revolver, a dagger, and broadsword,—all which were disposed about his bed. He was afflicted with paroxysms of acute pain in the head, as if a poignard had been driven through the brain, and with dreams full of horror and despair. On awaking in the morning, he felt as if he had been abroad in the night wind, dragged through places by some invisible power, and ridden by a witch for fifty miles. Still, on escaping from these ghastly midnight visions his intellect seems to have regained its usual clearness and discrimination. When the 'Testimony' was completed, his medical advisers counselled him to abstain from further labour; to use the warm sponge-bath, and take some medicines which they prescribed. No one appears to have apprehended danger. The evening of his last day was spent with his family. He read aloud Cowper's 'Castaway,'—an ominous and melancholy strain; the sonnet to Mary Unwin, and some lighter verses. He then retired to his study, and used the bath, but left untasted the medicine. His medical friends, conscious, as they said, that there were

PROMOTIONS.

'head symptoms,' and that his brain had been overworked, should certainly have seen that the fire-arms were removed and the medicine—most probably an opiate—taken. The unfortunate patient slept alone, at a distance from his family; he seems again to have had one of his harrowing dreams, or trances; and, on awaking, he must have meditated self-destruction. He wrote on a folio sheet of paper, in a hand much larger than usual, the following valedictory fragment:—

" 'Dearest Lydia,—My brain burns, I *must* have walked; and a fearful dream rises upon me. I cannot bear the horrible thought. God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ have mercy upon me! Dearest Lydia, dear children, farewell! My brain burns as the recollection grows. My dear, dear wife, farewell!

' HUGH MILLER.'

" In order to facilitate the fatal pistol-shot, he opened his shirt and flannel vest, and placed the muzzle of the pistol close to his breast: the report was not heard, but next morning the body was found, half-dressed, stretched on the floor, the revolver having fallen from his hand, or been thrown by him into the bath. The aim was sure and steady—the bullet entered the left breast, and death must have been instantaneous. A sad and miserable termination to a life-drama full of noble lessons and of manly and successful struggles!"

24. In the Glasgow Town's Hospital, Mrs. Reston, better known as "the heroine of Matagorda." She was with her husband, a sergeant in the 94th, when the French bombarded Matagorda, in 1810, where she made herself conspicuous in her attendance upon the wounded. Being left destitute by the death of her husband, a subscription was raised which afforded a comfortable maintenance.

26. At Sion Row, Clifton, Brigadier-General Dacres Fitzherbert Evans, late of the H.E.I.C.S.

27. At Chelsworth Hall, Suffolk, aged 77, Catherine Frances, Lady Austen.

28. In Half-Moon Street, aged 72, the Lord John Fitz-Roy, youngest son of the late Duke of Grafton.

29. At Clater Park, Bromyard, aged 54, William Barneby, esq., High Sheriff of Herefordshire in 1849, and an active magistrate of that county.

30. At Paris, Lady Maria de Fontanelle, sister of the Earl of Essex.

— Caroline, wife of the Right Hon. Sir J. Romilly, Master of the Rolls,

daughter of William Otter, late Bishop of Chichester, and sister to Lord Belper.

30. At Viewville House, N.B., the Hon. Mrs. Peter Ramsay, daughter of the late and sister to the present Right Hon. Lord Belhaven and Stinton.

— At Leith, Rear-Admiral James Stevenson.

31. At Upper Norton Street, Portland Place, Signor Crivelli, son of the celebrated tenor. He was a musician and singer of great repute, and had been the professor of singing at the Royal Academy of Music since its foundation.

— At Lough Fea, county of Monaghan, Evelyn Shirley, esq., of Easington Park, Warwickshire, and Lough Fea, county of Monaghan, Ireland.

— At Killiney, Lady Betham, widow of Sir William Betham, Ulster King-at-Arms; sister to Judge Crampton, and cousin to Sir Philip Crampton, bart.

CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS, &c.

1856.

JANUARY.

Hon. P. C. Scarlett, C.B., to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Emperor of Brazil.

Mr. John Foster to be Secretary to the Commissioners of Lunacy.

Mr. Bramwell to be a Baron of the Exchequer.

Mr. Serjeant Miller to be a County Court Judge at Leicester.

Mr. J. Brant to be Consul at Damascus.

Mr. C. Wilthew to be Consul at Islay, Peru.

Mr. R. Andrews to be Assistant Barrister for Wexford.

Sir C. O'Loughlin to be Assistant Barrister for Carlow.

Mr. M. B. Sausse, Q.C., to be Puisne Judge of Bombay.

Mr. W. C. Rowe to be Chief Justice of Ceylon.

Mr. Stirling to be Puisne Minister in the Supreme Court at Ceylon.

The Queen has been pleased to give and grant unto Gen. Sir J. Simpson, G.C.B.,

PROMOTIONS.

Her Majesty's royal licence and permission that he may accept and wear the Imperial Order of the Medjidie of the First Class, which the Sultan hath been pleased to confer on him as a mark of his Imperial Majesty's approbation of his distinguished services before the enemy during the present war, and that he may enjoy all the rights and privileges thereunto belonging.

Mr. Paynter, Metropolitan Police Magistrate, has been transferred to the Westminster Court.

Mr. C. O. Dayman to be Magistrate of the Hammersmith and Wandsworth Police Courts.

Dep. Com. General J. Laidley to be Commissary General.

Assist. Commissaries General T. G. S. Swan, J. MacFarlan, J. W. Wybault, F. B. Archer, P. Turner, H. B. Morse, and F. S. Carpenter to be Commissaries General.

Mr. L. Brough to be Inspector of Coal Mines for Worcestershire and South Staffordshire.

Mr. R. Pashley, Q.C., to be Assistant Judge of the Middlesex Sessions.

Mr. G. H. Woolrych to be Clerk to the Metropolitan Board of Works.

Mr. S. H. Walpole, M.P., to be the Third Church Estates Commissioner.

To be Ordinary Members of the Military Div. of the Second Class, or Knights Commanders of the Bath :—Gen. J. W. Sleigh, C.B., Lieut.-Gen. R. G. H. Clarges, C.B., Vice-Adm. H. Prescott, C.B., Lieut.-Gen. J. McDonald, C.B., Lieut.-Gen. W. Rowan, C.B., Vice-Adm. B. Reynolds, C.B., Lieut.-Gen. W. G. Moore, Maj.-Gen. J. F. Love, C.B., Maj.-Gen. J. Jackson, Maj.-Gen. C. Yorke, Rear-Adm. the Hon. R. S. Dundas, C.B., Maj.-Gen. L. B. Lovell, Adj.-Gen. Sir G. Maclean, kt., Commis.-Gen. Dr. J. Hall, Inspector-Gen. of Hospitals, Maj.-Gen. W. F. Williams, Maj.-Gen. G. A. Wetherall, C.B.

To be Ordinary Members of the Civil Division of the Second Class, or Knights Commanders of the Order of the Bath :—Maj. H. C. Rawlinson, C.B., J. L. M. Lawrence, esq., Maj.-Gen. W. H. Sleeman, Maj.-Gen. J. Outram, C.B., B. Hawes, esq.

To be Ordinary Members of the Military Division of the Third Class, or Companions of the Order of the Bath :—Lieut.-Gen. W. Sutherland, Capt. the Hon. H. Keppel, R.N., Capt. Lord C. Paget, R.N., Capt. G. Goldsmith, R.N., Capt. G. Ramsay, R.N., Capt. G. H. Seymour, R.N., Capt. G. G. Wellesley, R.N., Col. H. F. Lockyer, Col. E. B. Reynardson,

Col. C. Trollope, Col. T. St. George, R.A., Capt. H. Caldwell, R.N., Capt. S. Osborne, R.N., Lieut.-Col. T. S. Powell, Lieut.-Col. A. St. George Stepney, Lieut.-Col. L. S. O'Connor, Lieut.-Col. W. W. Turner, Lieut.-Col. G. Bent, R.E., Lieut.-Col. E. F. Bouchier, R.E., Lieut.-Col. H. A. Lake, Maj. H. F. Strange, R.E., Maj. H. C. C. Owen, R.E., Maj. J. F. M. Browne, R.E., D. Deas, esq., Dr. D. Dumbreck, Dr. W. Linton, Dr. J. Forrest, T. Alexander, esq., J. R. Taylor, esq., Dr. A. Gordon, T. Monat, esq., G. Adams, esq., J. W. Smith, esq., W. H. Drake, esq.

To be Ordinary Members of the Civil Division of the Third Class, or Companions of the Order of the Bath :—E. D. Thompson, esq., A. Stewart, esq., Lieut.-Col. R. K. Dawson, R.E., Lieut.-Gen. H. Cubbon, J. H. Maxwell, esq.

MEMBERS RETURNED TO SERVE IN PARLIAMENT.

Armagh.—Joshua Walter M'Geough Bond, esq.

Renfrew.—Right Hon. Edward Pleydell Bouverie.

Hertford.—Right Hon. William Francis Cowper.

Wells.—Hedworth Hylton Jolliffe, esq.

Tolnes.—Earl of Gifford.

Kidderminster.—Right Hon. Robert Lowe.

Southwark.—Vice-Admiral Sir Charles Napier.

Huntingdon (County).—James Rust, esq.

Lincoln.—Gervaise Tottenham Waldo Sibthorp, esq.

FEBRUARY.

Mr. W. H. Hellyer to be Dep. Judge Advocate of the Fleet at Portsmouth.

Mr. G. Gowau to be Chief Clerk in the Secretary's Office, G.P.O., Edinburgh.

Mr. Bazalgette to be Engineer to the Metropolitan Board of Works.

Mr. G. S. Hattan to be Accountant to the Metropolitan Board of Works.

The Queen was this day pleased to confer the honour of knighthood upon R. G. Macdonnell, esq., C.B.

The Queen has been pleased to give and grant unto Maj.-Gen. W. F. Williams, K.C.B.,

PROMOTIONS.

Her Majesty's royal licence and permission that he may accept and wear the Imperial Order of the Medjidie of the First Class, which the Sultan has been pleased to confer upon him, as a mark of his Imperial Majesty's approbation of his distinguished services before the enemy during the present war, and particularly of his gallant defence of Kars, and that he may enjoy all the rights and privileges thereunto belonging.

The Queen has also been pleased to give and grant unto Lieut.-Col. H. A. Lake Her Majesty's royal licence and permission that he may accept and wear the Imperial Order of the Medjidie of the Second Class; unto Capt. H. L. Thompson, a Major in the Turkish service; Capt. C. C. Teesdale, a Lieut.-Col. in the Turkish service; H. Sandwith, esq., M.D., Acting Inspector-General of Hospitals, in the Turkish service; and H. A. Churchill, esq., a volunteer, Her Majesty's royal licence and permission that they may accept and wear the Third Class of the same Order. And unto J. Zohrab, esq., and T. R. Rennison, esq., Interpreters, Her Majesty's royal licence and permission that they may accept and wear the Fourth Class of the same Order, which the Sultan hath been pleased to confer upon them respectively, as a mark of his Imperial Majesty's approbation of their distinguished services before the enemy during the defence of Kars, and that they may enjoy all the rights and privileges thereunto belonging.

Mr. F. Manable to be Superintending Architect to the Metropolitan Board of Works.

Mr. E. B. Cowell to be Professor of Modern History and Political Economy in the Presidency College of Calcutta.

Mr. C. Temple to be a Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of the Island of Ceylon.

Hon. G. W. Edwardes to be Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over the Island of Labuan and its Dependencies.

Mr. S. Petrie to be Director General of the Commissariat Branch.

Assist.-Surgeon G. Liebig to be Professor of Natural History and Geology in the Presidency College, East Indies.

MEMBERS RETURNED TO SERVE IN
PARLIAMENT.

Meath.—Edward MacEvoy, esq.

Taunton.—Right Hon. Henry Labouchere.

Leeds.—Right Hon. Matthew Talbot Baines.

Midhurst.—Samuel Warren, esq.

Tamworth.—Viscount Raynham.

Rochester.—Philip Wykeham Martin, esq.

Cambridge University.—Right Hon. Spencer Horatio Walpole.

Newcastle upon Tyne.—George Ridley, esq.

Edinburgh.—Adam Black, esq.

Leominster.—Gathorne Hardy, esq.

Wigtonshire.—Sir Andrew Agnew, bt.

MARCH.

Mr. R. B. P. Lyons to be Secretary to Her Majesty's Legation at Florence.

Mr. J. L. Swift to be Consul at Buffalo, United States of America.

Mr. E. J. Turner to be Consul at Carthage, Spain.

Lord Leigh to be Lord Lieutenant of Warwickshire.

To be Knight Grand Cross of the Bath:—Lord Panmure (Civil Branch).

Hon. E. Drummond to be Accountant-General to the Government of India.

Mr. H. Vansittart to be a Commissioner of Customs, North Western Provinces, East Indies.

Mr. W. D. Christie to be Minister Plenipotentiary to the Argentine Confederation.

Mr. J. W. Jones to be promoted to the office of Librarian of the Department of Printed Books in the British Museum.

Mr. T. Watts to be the Assistant Librarian to the British Museum.

Mr. Saunders to be Recorder of Plymouth.

Mr. J. W. Gladstone to be Comptroller of the Inland Department of the General Post Office, Dublin.

The Earl of Caithness to be Lieutenant and Sheriff Principal of the Shire of Caithness.

Mr. J. H. Darrell to be Chief Justice, Mr. D. Stewart Attorney-General, and Mr. S. Harvey Solicitor-General for the Bermudas.

Sir G. R. Clerk, K.C.B., to be Second Permanent Secretary to the India Board.

Mr. J. Scott to be Lieut.-Governor of the district of Natal, in South Africa.

Assistant-Commissary-General L. Routh to be Deputy Commissary-General.

Mr. H. S. Selfe to be a Metropolitan Police Magistrate.

PROMOTIONS.

Mr. J. Duff to be Lieutenant and Sheriff
Principal of the Shire of Banff.

Ennis.—John David FitzGerald, esq.
Athlone.—Hon. Captain Henry Hand-
cock.

MEMBERS RETURNED TO SERVE IN
PARLIAMENT.

Boston.—Herbert Ingram, esq.
Rutland.—Hon. Gilbert Heathcote.
Sligo.—Right Hon. John Wynne.

APRIL.

Sir H. D. Jones to be Governor of Sand-
hurst Military College.

Dep. Inspector-Gen. of Hospitals W.
Linton, C.B., to be Inspector-General,
with local rank in Crimea.

Mr. W. Keogh, Attorney-General, to be
a Justice of the Court of Common Pleas in
Ireland.

Mr. J. D. FitzGerald, Solicitor-General,
to be Attorney-General in Ireland.

Mr. G. Fagan to be Secretary to Her
Majesty's Legation at Buenos Ayres.

Col. G. F. Herman to be Consul-General
of Tripoli.

Mr. G. M. Dowdeswell to be Recorder
of Newbury.

Mr. J. T. Kinnersley to be Police Ma-
gistrate for Birmingham.

Mr. J. Christian to be Solicitor-General,
Ireland.

Maj.-Gen. J. Ontram to be Chief Com-
missioner and Agent to the Governor-
General in the Province of Oude.

Mr. G. Couper to be Civil Secretary,
East Indies.

Sir W. à Beckett to be Judge of the
Vice-Admiralty Court of the Colony of
Victoria, Australia.

Mr. J. L. Smith to be Attorney-General
for the Colony of British Guiana.

Mr. T. W. Parlow to be Queen's Advo-
cate for the Colony of Sierra Leone.

Dep. Commissary-Gen. G. Adams, C.B.,
to be Commissary-General.

Mr. G. S. Duff to be Lieut. and Sheriff
Principal of the Shire of Elgin, Scotland.

The Earl of Caithness to be Lord in
Waiting in Ordinary to Her Majesty.

MEMBERS RETURNED TO SERVE IN
PARLIAMENT.

Lymington.—Edward John Hutchins,
esq.

Chippenham.—Robert Parry Nisbet, esq.

New Ross.—Charles Tottenham, esq.

MAY.

General Vivian to be a Director of the
East India Company.

Mr. J. C. Maxwell to be Professor of
Natural Philosophy at Mareschal College
and University, Aberdeen.

Mr. Alan Ker to be Chief Justice of
Dominica.

Mr. D. Cameron to be Chief Justice of
Vancouver's Island.

To be Ordinary Members of the Military
Division of the Second Class, or Knights
Commanders of the Order of the Bath :—
Maj.-Gen. H. W. Barnard, C.B., Henry
Lord Rokeby.

Lord Wodehouse to be Minister Pleni-
potentiary at the Court of St. Petersburg.

R. W. Grey, M.P., to be Secretary to
the Poor Law Board.

Mr. S. Rice to be Deputy Chairman of
the Customs Board.

Mr. G. Berkeley to be Commissioner of
Customs.

Hon. J. Fane to be First Secretary to
the British Embassy at St. Petersburg.

The Duke of Somerset, Lord Stanley,
Mr. S. Herbert, Mr. E. Ellice, Lieut.-Gen.
E. B. Wynyard, Sir De Lacy Evans, Sir
H. D. Jones, Sir H. J. W. Bentinck, Mr.
G. C. Glynn, and Col. E. R. Wetherall,
to be Commissioners to inquire into the
system of purchase and sale of Commis-
sions in the Army.

Mr. M. T. Baines to be a Charity Com-
missioner.

Mr. R. W. Keate to be Governor of
Trinidad.

Mr. M. Power to be Lieut.-Governor of
Grenada.

The Earl Granville to be Ambassador
Extraordinary to the Emperor of Russia,
on the occasion of His Majesty's corona-
tion.

Sir H. Barkly to be Governor of Victoria.

Mr. J. L. Smith to be Attorney-General
of British Guiana.

Sir H. Bulwer to be Special British
Commissioner at Bucharest, to investigate
the present state of the Danubian Prin-
cipalities.

The Earl of Shaftesbury to be Lord
Lieutenant of Dorsetshire.

The Earl of Kintore to be Lord Licu-
tenant of Kincardineshire.

Lieut.-Gen. M. Cubbon, C.B., H.E.I.C.S.,
to be an Ordinary Member of the Civil

PROMOTIONS.

Division of the Second Class, or Knights Commanders of the Bath.

Sir A. Currie to be Principal Clerk of Sessions, Scotland.

MEMBERS RETURNED TO SERVE IN PARLIAMENT.

Cheltenham.—Francis William Fitzhardinge Berkeley, esq.

Longford (County).—Hervey George Hughes, esq.

JUNE.

The Queen has been pleased to direct letters patent to be passed under the Great Seal, granting the dignity of a Baron of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland unto Rear-Admiral Sir Edmund Lyons, bart., G.C.B., by the name, style, and title of Baron Lyons of Christchurch, in the County of Southampton, and to the heirs male of his body lawfully begotten.

Viscount Sidney to be Lord Lieutenant of the County of Kent.

Mr. B. Price and Mr. St. John to be Commissioners to inquire into the constitution of the Scotch Fisheries Board.

Mr. Stanley to be Comptroller and Accountant-General of the Stamps and Taxes Department, Dublin.

Mr. W. H. Magrath, Mr. T. FitzGerald, and Mr. E. Geale to be Crown Solicitors in Ireland.

Mr. R. B. Lamb to be Consul in the Island of St. Thomas.

Capt. Sullivan, R.N., to be Third Commissioner to inquire into the working of the Fishery Board of Scotland.

Mr. R. L. Swift to be Consul at Riga, Russia.

Mr. J. B. Williams to be Consul at Seville.

Captain Sir B. W. Walker to be a Baronet.

Mr. J. Worlledge to be Judge of the County Court, Suffolk.

Mr. B. Edwards to be Chief Justice at Jamaica.

Mr. W. J. Wilkinson and Mr. W. F. Lewis to be Puisne Judges at Jamaica.

Mr. J. F. Cargill to be a Puisne Judge at Jamaica.

Mr. J. W. Hertslet to be Consul at Königsberg.

Mr. T. L. Bozi to be Consul at Cologne.

Sir C. Wood to be a Knight Grand Cross (Civil Division) of the Bath.

Mr. H. A. Churchill to be a Companion of the Civil Division of the Bath.

Mr. C. Saunders to be County Court Judge at Plymouth.

Capt. Gambier to be a Director of Convict Prisons.

MEMBERS RETURNED TO SERVE IN PARLIAMENT.

Lichfield.—Viscount Sandon.

Leicester (Borough).—John Biggs, esq.

JULY.

Mr. P. Caruthers to be Consul at Tanganyika.

Mr. C. B. Hillier to be Consul at Siam.

Mr. C. Jackson to be Chief Commissioner of Oude.

The Earl of Shelburne to be Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs.

Mr. A. Fraser to be Consul at Batavia.

Mr. T. Bonhote to be Consul at Sourabaya.

Mr. D. MacLaine to be Consul at Samarang.

H.R.H. The Duke of Cambridge to be General Commanding in Chief.

Maj.-Gen. Sir C. Yorke, K.C.B., to be Military Secretary to H.R.H. the General Commanding in Chief.

Mr. H. T. Davis to be Chief Magistrate for the Colony of Hong Kong.

To be Knights Commanders of the Order of the Bath, Sir W. T. Denison and Rear-Adm. C. Elliot (Civil Division of the Second Class).

Mr. F. Stephens to be Consul at Trebizonde.

Mr. H. Lorentz to be Consul at Wibourg.

Mr. Ferguson to be Examiner in Surgery at the London University.

Mr. T. H. Huxley to be Examiner in Comparative Anatomy and Physiology in the University of London.

Mr. G. Busk to be Hunterian Professor of Comparative Anatomy and Physiology in the Royal College of Surgeons of England.

Professor Fraser to be Professor of Logic in the University of Edinburgh.

To be Knights Commanders of the Bath (Civil Division), Hon. J. D. Bligh, Sir Arthur C. Magenis, John Fiennes Cramp-ton.

MEMBERS RETURNED TO SERVE IN PARLIAMENT.

Calne.—Sir William Fenwick Williams bart.

Dorchester.—Charles Napier Sturt, esq.

AUGUST.

Viscount Castlerosse to be Comptroller of Her Majesty's Household.

Mr. H. S. Parkes to be Consul at Canton.

Mr. S. Manning, Mr. Koe, Mr. Cooke, Mr. Worledge, and Mr. Turner, to be a Standing Committee to frame Rules of Practice, and regulate Costs of Attorneys, under the recent County Courts Act.

Mr. H. Nichol to be Secretary to the County Courts Committee.

Mr. C. H. Darling to be Governor of Jamaica.

Mr. J. O'Connell to be Clerk of the Hanaper, Ireland.

Mr. C. E. de Michele reappointed Consul at St. Petersburg.

SEPTEMBER.

Colonel Wilford to be Governor of the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich.

Mr. J. J. Wickson to be Crown Solicitor for the Island of Hong Kong.

Mr. W. G. Dickson to be Procureur and Advocate-General for the Island of Mauritius.

Mr. W. Snagg to be Chief Justice of the Island of Antigua.

Mr. H. A. Churchill, C.B., to be Consul in Bosnia.

Mr. J. J. Hickson to be Crown Solicitor for the Island of Hong Kong.

Brig.-Gen. W. R. Mansfield to be Consul-General at Warsaw.

OCTOBER.

Thomas Alexander, C.B., to be Inspector-General of Hospitals in Canada.

Mr. G. S. L. Hunt to be Consul at Porto Rico.

Mr. J. L. McLeod to be Consul at Mozambique.

Sir T. N. Redington, K.C.B., Mr. R. Andrews, Mr. R. W. S. Lutwidge, Mr. J. Wilkes, and Dr. D. J. Corregan to be Commissioners for the purpose of inquiring into the state of the Lunatic Asylums in Ireland.

Mr. M. J. Barry to be Secretary to the Lunacy Commission.

Mr. T. Burcham to be a Police Magistrate.

General Lord Seaton to be Lieutenant-Governor of Chelsea Hospital.

Mr. Phelan to be Secretary to the Board of Superintendence of Dublin Hospitals.

Hon. G. C. Talbot to be Private Secre-

tary to the Governor-General of the East Indies.

Majors Talbot, Triton, Freeth, Mr. H. G. Scott, Rev. R. N. Maddock, Mr. J. Peyton, and Mr. J. B. N. Hennessey to be Commissioners for the settlement of Mussoorie.

Mr. M. Perrin to be Secretary to the Lord Chancellor of Ireland.

Mr. Woodcock to be Solicitor-General of the Island of Antigua.

NOVEMBER.

Mr. E. H. Bunbury to be Secretary to the Cambridge University Commission.

Mr. Justice Blackburne to be Lord Justice of the New Court of Appeals, Ireland.

Mr. A. Davoren to be Chief Justice of the Island of Nevis.

General Sir E. Blakeney to be Governor of Chelsea Hospital.

General Sir A. Woodford to be Lieut.-Governor of Chelsea Hospital.

Mr. W. H. Watson, Q.C., to be a Baron of the Exchequer.

Col. Keogh to be Stipendiary Magistrate in Ireland.

Mr. C. Blunt to be Consul at Smyrna.

Mr. C. J. Calvert to be Consul at Salonica.

Lord Belper, Sir A. Spearman, Sir E. Ryan, Lord Monck, and Mr. Weguelin to be Royal Commissioners to inquire into the state of the Civil Service.

Mr. M. Berry to be a Judge at Perth, Western Australia.

Mr. W. Ritchie to be Advocate-General of Bengal.

Mr. R. W. Keate to be Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over the Island of Trinidad.

The Duke of Newcastle to be Lord Lieutenant of Nottinghamshire.

Sir Alex. Cockburn to be Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas.

Sir R. Bethell to be Attorney-General.

Mr. J. S. Wortley to be Solicitor-General.

The Earl of Ellesmere to be Lord Rector of King's College, Aberdeen.

Sir E. Bulwer-Lytton to be Lord Rector of Glasgow University.

Lord Vivian to be Lord Lieutenant of the County of Cornwall.

DECEMBER.

Mr. G. B. Mathew to be Consul at Odessa.

PROMOTIONS.

Mr. J. MacAndrew, M.D., to be Inspector-General of Hospitals.

Mr. J. S. Stock to be Recorder of Exeter.

Mr. G. A. Arney to be Recorder of Winchester.

Sir A. B. Gordon, bt., to be a Commissioner of the Inland Revenue.

Mr. R. Pattinson to be Governor of Heligoland.

Mr. W. Harding to be Recorder of Natal.

Mr. R. Gurney to be Recorder of London.

Mr. J. Lambert to be Poor Law Inspector.

Rev. A. P. Stanley to be Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford.

Mr. G. Compi to be a Judge at Malta.

Mr. S. V. Surtees to be Chief Judge at the Mauritius.

Mr. J. E. Remono to be Puisne Judge at the Mauritius.

The Earl Granville to be Chancellor of the University of London.

Mr. K. W. Collett to be Her Majesty's Advocate for the Colony of Sierra Leone.

Mr. H. J. Ross to be Attorney-General for the Island of Grenada.

Mr. W. Stephenson to be Governor of Mauritius.

Mr. F. Seymour to be Superintendent of Honduras.

Lord Napier to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the U. S. of America.

Dr. T. Mayo to be President of the Royal College of Physicians.

Mr. Kierman to be Clerk of the Crown for the County of Leitrim.

Commander W. Hoscason, R.N., to be Superintendent of the Ports and Quarantine of Malta.

The Queen has been pleased to give and grant unto Colonel the Hon. W. L. Pakenham, C.B., Her Majesty's royal licence and permission that he may accept and wear the Cross of a Commander of the Second Class of the Order of St. Maurice and St. Lazarus, which the King of Sardinia hath been pleased to confer upon him, in testimony of his approbation of his distinguished services before the enemy during the late war.

The following promotions in the Order of the Bath are in recognition of services of the officers of the Army and Marine of his Imperial Majesty the Emperor of the French.

To be Knights Grand Cross:—Marshal Bosquet; Generals of Divisions—De Salles, De MacMahon, Regnault de St. Jean d'Angely, and Morris.

To be Knights Commanders:—Generals of Divisions—M. de Martimprey, M. Thiry, M. Niel, M. Camou, M. Paté, M. de Autemarre d'Erville, M. de Allonville, M. Levassant, M. Dulac, M. Dalesme, M. Herbillon, M. Bouat, Rear-Adm. de Genouilly, Gen. de Aurelles de Paladines, Gen. Melinet, Rear-Adm. C. Penaud.

To be Companions:—Generals of Divisions—M. Espinasse, M. Bazaine, M. de Failly, M. de La Motterouge, M. Faucheux, M. Uhrich, M. Larehey, M. Vinoy. Generals of Brigade—M. Leboeuf, M. Cassaignolles, M. Trochu, M. Frossard, M. Feray, M. Walsin Esterhazy, M. Lafont de Villiers, M. Bisson, M. de Forton, M. Couston, M. Vergé, M. Niol, M. Cler, M. de Cisse, M. Montenard, M. Bourbaki, M. de Lorencez, M. Wimpffen, M. de Champeron, M. Soleille, M. de Beville, M. Duprat de Laroquette, M. Manèque, M. Borel de Bretizel, M. de Puibusque, M. Forgeot, M. Coffinieres, M. de Tourne- mine, M. Janin, M. Picard, M. Goze, M. Decaen, M. Lefebvre, M. de Ferraboue, M. Beuret (Art.), M. Blanchot, M. Paris de la Bollardiére, Military Intendant, M. Beuret (Inf.), Military Intendants M. Bondurand and M. Angot. Colonels of Etat Major—M. Dieu, M. Jarras, M. Desaint, M. Raoult, M. Besson, M. de Waubert de Genlis, M. Reille, M. Lalle- mand, M. de Cornély, M. Renson, M. Auger, M. Forgeot, M. Desusleau. Colonels—M. Auger (Art.), M. Le François (Art.), M. Jourjon, M. Laterrade, 80th, M. Datin, 18th, M. Collineau, 1st, M. Lefebvre, 21st, M. de Castagny, 82nd, M. de Sorbiers, 26th, M. Sourin, 2nd, M. Comignan, 39th, M. Rose (Alg. Tirail), M. Polhes, 3rd, M. Montaudon, 42nd, M. Donay, 2nd, M. de Vernon, M. Gagneur, M. de Bentz- mann, M. de Bertier, 6th, M. Ressayre, 6th, M. Lion, 1st, M. Duhesme, 7th, M. De la Martinière, 9th, M. Crespin, 6th, M. de Rochebouet, M. Serive, Principal Physician, M. de Berckheim, Chef d'Es- cadron of the Artillery. Captains—M. Ohier, M. Pothnan, and M. de Saisset.

ARMY PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS.

JANUARY.

Royal Sappers and Miners.—Lieut.-Col. F. A. Yorke, R.E., to be Assist.-Adj.-

PROMOTIONS.

General ; 7th Foot, Brev. Major C. E. Watson to be Major ; Prov. Dépôt Batt., Brev. Lieut.-Col. F. White, C.B., to be Major.

Unattached, Capt. H. R. Manners to be Major ; Brevet Majors R. L. Ross, H. W. Meredith, and C. Hood to substantive rank.

Brevet Lieut.-Colonel A. A. Shuttleworth, R.A., to be Colonel ; Lieut.-Col. T. A. Shone to be Col. (*hon.*) ; Capt. H. E. Austen to be Major ; Brevet Major H. E. Austen to be Lieut.-Col. ; Capt. J. Young to be Major ; Brevet Major J. Young to be Lieutenant-Colonel ; Brevet Major E. S. Burnaby, Grenadier Guards (*temp.*), Lieut.-Colonel in British Italian Legion ; Brevet Major D. K. Makenzie, Brevet Major J. E. Thackwell, and Major E. C. Legh to be Lieut.-Cols. ; Capts. D. C. Greene, W. Warry, W. H. D. Fitzgerald, E. Newdegate, F. E. N. Tinley, G. E. B. Westhead to be Majors ; Brevet Major H. Edwardes, C.B., Bengal Army, to be Lieut.-Col. in the army ; Captains A. B. Rathborne, 24th B.N.I., J. Travers, 2nd B.N.I., H. J. Pelly, 8th B.N.I., E. L. Russell, 12th B.N.I., R. R. Younghusband, 20th B.N.I., H. F. Dunsford, 59th B.N.I., J. M. B. F. Tytler, 37th B.N.I., J. Mill, B.A., C. Reid, 10th B.N.I., A. W. C. Plowden, 3rd B. Lt. Cav., R. Strachey, B.E., R. B. Smith, B.E., C. F. North, B.E., P. A. P. Bouverie, 35th B.N.I., J. R. Becher, B.E., J. Hill, B.E., A. J. M. Boileau, M.E., to be Majors in the Army.

5th Foot, Brevet Major J. E. Simmons to be Major ; 1st Light Drags., Major C. Perceval to be Lieutenant-Colonel commanding ; 2nd Light Dragoons, Major J. Elphinstone Fleming to be Lieut.-Col. Comdt. ; 4th Lt. Infantry, Major J. Hambly Humfrey to be Lieut.-Col. Commandant.

Provisional Dépôt Battalion, Captain J. N. K. A. Yonge to be Major.

Unattached, Captains and Brevet Lieutenant-Colonels R. Blane, E. Gilling Hallewell, Captain and Brevet Major S. Hackett, Lieutenant and Captain and Brevet Major A. C. Greville to substantive rank.

Brevet : Lieutenant-Colonel C. E. Doherty to be Colonel ; C. F. Havelock to local rank of Colonel in Turkish Contingent ; Lieutenant-Colonel J. R. Raines (*temp.*), Colonel British Swiss Legion ; Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel W. Norris, C.B., D.Q.G. Turkish Contingent, local rank of Colonel in Turkey.

Commissariat Department, Deputy Commissary-General J. Laidley to be Commissary-General ; Assistant Commissary-Generals T. G. S. Swan, J. MacFarlan,

J. W. Wybanlt, F. B. Archer, P. Turner, H. B. Morse, F. S. Carpenter to be Deputy Commissary-Generals.

55th Foot, Captain J. Friend to be Major ; 77th Foot, Major J. W. Thomas to be Major.

British Italian Legion, 1st Regiment, Major Sir Connts Lindsay, bart., to be Lieutenant-Colonel Commandant.

Unattached, Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel A. C. Cure, Brevet Major J. Lawrie, and Brevet Major H. Disney Ellis to substantive rank.

Brevet : Lieut.-Colonel N. M. Stack, Lieut.-Col. A. Spottiswoode to be Colonels.

13th Foot, Brevet Major J. W. Cox to be Major ; 17th Foot, Major O. Paget Bourke to be Lieutenant-Colonel ; 60th Foot, Captain W. J. Yonge to be Major ; 93rd Foot, Lieutenant-Colonel Hon. A. Hope to be Lieutenant-Colonel.

Unattached, Major and Brevet Lieutenant-Colonels J. S. Wood, C.B., and Hon. A. Hope to substantive rank ; Capt. and Brevet Lieut.-Col. H. A. Strachan to substantive rank of Major.

Brevet-Major General P. Grant, C.B., to local rank of Lieutenant-General, E.I. ; Brevet Major J. H. Laye to be Lieut.-Col.

EAST INDIAN ARMY.—On death of Lieutenant-General Benjn. Roope, B.I., Major-General J. Anderson, B.I., to be Lieutenant-General ; Colonel H. Lawrence, B.I., to be Major-General ; Colonel W. E. A. Elliott, M.I., to be Major-General (*hon.*) ; Lieutenant-Colonels J. Ludlow, B.I., C. J. Lewis, B.I., W. S. Adams, B.I., to be Colonels (*hon.*) ; Majors W. Elsay, M.I., S. S. Trevor, M.A., T. G. Fraser, B.I., E. Sunderland, B.A., W. P. Meares, B.I., C. P. Wilder, M.I.C., F. A. Close, B.I., H. R. C. King, M.I.C., to be Lieutenant-Colonels ; Hon. Captains J. Skinner, B.I.C., W. Jones, B.E., to be Majors.

FEBRUARY.

4th Foot, Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel, J. J. Hort to be Lieutenant-Colonel.

96th Foot, Brevet Major E. W. Scovell to be Major.

Unattached, Lieutenant and Captain and Brevet Colonel E. R. Wetherall to substantive rank of Major ; Brevet Major F. P. Lea to substantive rank.

Staff, Lieutenant-Colonel C. Sillery to be Commandant of Hospital, Scutari.

Brevet : Captain W. E. Sweny to be Major ; Brevet Major W. E. Sweny to be Lieutenant-Colonel.

PROMOTIONS.

60th Foot, Lieutenant-General Sir G. Moore, K.C.B., to be Colonel Commandant of a Battalion.

30th Foot, Major E. A. Whitmore to be Lieutenant-Colonel.

Brevet: Captain W. A. T. Payne to be Major; Captain F. Richardson, 30th Foot, to be Major; Brevet Major F. Richardson to be Lieutenant-Colonel; Captain C. Coote to be Major; Brevet Major C. Coote to be Lieutenant-Colonel.

63rd Foot, Brevet Major C. E. Fairtlough to be Major.

Unattached, Brevet Major G. F. C. Pocock to substantive rank; Major and Brevet Lieut.-Col. C. E. Michel to be Lt.-Col.

Assistant Commis.-General L. Routh to be Dep. Com.-Gen.

Hospital Staff, Dep. Inspector-General W. Linton, M.D., to be Inspector-Gen. local rank.

British Ital. Legion; 3rd Rifle Reg., Maj. R. H. Fitzherbert to be Lieut.-Col.

Brevet Major C. Higginbotham to be Lieut.-Col.

Brig.-Gen. Baron R. C. Von Stutterheim to temp. rank of Major-Gen. while commanding the British German Legion; Capt. and Brevet Lieut.-Col. C. Dickson, R.A., to local rank of Major-Gen. while commanding the artillery of the Turkish Contingent; Capt. G. J. De Winton to temp. rank of Major while attached to the British Swiss Legion.

EAST INDIAN ARMY.—Major F. C. Wells, B.N.I., Major A. B. Rathborne, B.N.I., Major J. Travers, B.N.I., Major E. G. Austin, B.A., Major H. J. Pelly, B.N.I., Major M. Mackenzie, B.A., to be Lieut.-Cols.

Major H. Colbeck, M.I., Maj. J. Ramsay, B.I., Major A. Salmon, M.I., Major T. R. Morse, B.I., Major H. Dyke, B.I., to be Lieut.-Cols. (*hon.*)

Capt. R. R. Scutt, M.I., Capt. P. Ogilvie, M.I., Capt. C. A. Blagrove, M.I., to be Majors (*hon.*).

Royal Artillery, Brevet Colonel H. G. Teesdale to be Col.; Brevet Major G. A. Maude, C.B., to be Lieut.-Col.; Second Capt. C. Wright to be Capt.; Brevet Col. N. T. Lake, C.B., to be Col.; Capt. E. Maberley to be Lieut.-Col.; Second Capt. J. Thring to be Capt.; Capt. W. M. H. Dixon to be Lieut.-Col.; Second Capt. W. M. King to be Capt.; Capt. H. W. Montessor to be Lieut.-Col.; Second Captain L. H. F. Greville to be Capt.; Brevet Col. C. Dixon, C.B., to be Lieut.-Colonel; Capt. H. J. Thomas to be Lieut.-Colonel.

9th Foot, Captain C. H. Leslie to be

Major; 66th Foot, Major F. Hammond to be Major.

British German Legion, 6th Light Inf., E. K. Murray to be Lieutenant-Colonel Commandant.

British Italian Legion, Staff, Lieutenant-Colonel C. Read to be Lieutenant-Colonel Commandant.

Unattached, Brevet Lieut.-Colonel F. D. Lister, Brevet Major J. N. Sargent, Brev. Major G. L. F. Dixon, Adjutant of Depôt Battalion, to substantive rank.

Brevet Major F. Hammond to be Lieut.-Col.; Brev. Lieut.-Col. F. Hammond to be Colonel.

Turkish Contingent, Capt. Hon. H. M. Monckton, 3rd Light Dragoons, Captain J. Williams, Osmanli Cavalry, to be Majors (local rank).

MARCH.

63rd Foot, Major C. E. Fairtlough to be Lieut.-Col.; 87th Foot, Capt. A. H. Cobbe to be Major.

British Italian Legion, 4th Regt., Major R. Crauford to be Lieut.-Col.

Provisional Depôt Battalion, Capt. E. J. Holworthy to be Major.

Brevet Capt. and Brevet Lieut.-Col. J. Christie, B.L.C., to be Aide-de-Camp to the Queen, with rank of Colonel in the Army; Capt. F. Horatio de Vere, R.E., to be Major.

Capt. T. Garrett, Turkish Contingent, to local rank of Major in Turkey.

Brevet Major E. R. W. W. Yates to be Lieut.-Col.; Lieut.-Colonel J. Halkett to (*temp.*) Col. British Swiss Legion.

5th Foot, Lieut.-Gen. W. L. Walton to be Col.; 21st Foot, Lieut.-Col. Hon. J. L. Browne to be Lieut.-Col.

Provisional Depôt Battalion, Lord West, C.B., to be Lieut.-Col.

Scots Fusilier Guards, Brevet Col. J. H. Pringle to be Capt. and Lieut.-Colonel; 15th Foot, Brevet Major J. H. Wingfield to be Major; Unattached, Brevet Major Lumley Graham to substantive rank.

Brevet: On death of Field-Marshal Lord Raglan, G.C.B., Gen. Sir W. G. Davy, Gen. Sir J. Grey, K.C.B.; Lieut.-Gen. C. A. A. C. Repington, C.B., to be General.

Brevet Lieut.-Col. R. A. Cunthbert to be Col. (*hon.*); Major S. T. Christie to be Col.; Lieut.-Col. W. Irwin to be Col. (Assistant Quartermaster-Gen., Kilkenny.)

EAST INDIAN ARMY.—On death of Lt.-Gen. Sir J. H. Littler, G.C.B., B.I., Major-

PROMOTIONS.

Gen. F. Young to be Lieut.-Gen. ; Colonel R. Budd, M.I., to be Major-General.

To be Colonels :—Lt.-Cols. B. T. Phillips, B.L.C., G. Wright, M.I. To be Lt.-Colonels :—Majors T. D. Colyear, B.L.C., P. Shortreed, B.I., Sir H. C. Rawlinson, C.B., B.I. To be Major. :—Capt. J. Duncan, B.I.

APRIL.

Brevet : On death of Major-Gen. Sir J. Campbell, Gen. Sir W. G. Davy, C.B., Gen. Sir J. Grey, K.C.B. ; Major-Gen. C. A. Windham, C.B., Senior Supernumerary, to fixed establishment.

Lieut.-Col. Lord J. C. P. Murray, Scots Fusilier Guards, to be Col. ; Major N. S. Gardiner to be Lieut.-Col. ; Capt. G. W. C. Jackson, 7th Light Dragoons, to be Major.

The Field-Marshal Commanding in Chief has much gratification in publishing to the army the commands of the Queen for the promotion of Lieut.-Gen. Sir G. Brown, G.C.B., to the rank of General (the commission to bear date 7th Sept. last), for his distinguished services in the army in the Crimea, and while commanding the troops employed in the successful operations against Kertch.

Brevet Lt.-Gen. Sir G. Brown, G.C.B., to be Gen. in the Army ; Brevet Major J. C. Stock to be Lieut.-Col. (*hon.*)

Unattached, Brevet Major Hon. A. M. Cathcart to substantive rank.

Commissariat, Deputy Commissary-Gen. C. Adams, C.B., to be Commissary-Gen.

Lieut.-Col. C. H. Sommerset to be Col. ; Capt. G. Wightman to be Major ; Major F. Pinelli to be Lieut.-Col. (*hon.*)

16th Foot, Brevet Major S. W. P. Andain to be Major.

Brevet : Maj.-Gen. Sir Hugh H. Rose, K.C.B., promoted to local rank of Lieut.-Gen. in Turkey ; Capt. S. J. Hire, 22nd Bengal Native Infantry.

22nd Foot, Major and Brevet Lieut.-Col. J. E. Thackwell to be Major.

Royal Military College, Major-General Sir H. D. Jones, K.C.B., to be Governor.

MAY.

25th Foot, Major S. Wells to be Lieut.-Col.

35th Foot, Brevet Major F. English to be Major ; 56th Foot, Major R. W. Lacy to be Lieut.-Col. ; 83rd Foot, Major J. Kelsall to be Lieut.-Col.

British German Legion, 5th Light In-

fantry, Major J. Bathurst to be Lieut.-Col. Commandant.

7th Foot, Major R. Y. Shipley to be Lieut.-Col.

[Commissariat.—Assistant Commissary-General H. Green has been removed from the service, he having refused to obey an order to proceed on duty.]

Brevet : Lieut.-Col. H. H. Graham to be Col.

EAST INDIAN ARMY.—On the deaths of Gen. G. J. Greenstreet, B.I., and Lieut.-Gen. T. Wilson, C.B., B.I., Lieut.-Gen. M. Boyd, B.I., to be Gen. ; Major-Gen. W. R. C. Costley, B.I., Major-Gen. C. Herbert, C.B., M.I., to be Lieut.-Gens. ; Col. J. F. Caley, B.I., and Col. H. Dick, B.I., to be Major-Generals.

Major W. H. Lormer, B.I., Major T. James, B.I., to be Lieut.-Cols. (*hon.*)

Brevet : Major-Gen. C. A. Windham, C.B., to local rank of Lieut.-General in Turkey.

JUNE.

Brevet : Major-General Sir W. Eyre, K.C.B., to local rank of Lieut.-General in North America.

Maj.-Gen. Sir W. J. Codrington, K.C.B., having (with the local rank of general) commanded in chief Her Majesty's army in the Crimea during a period of war, and entirely to Her Majesty's satisfaction, Her Majesty has been pleased to command that, as a mark of Her Royal approbation, he be promoted to the rank of Lieut.-Gen. in the Army.

To be Lieutenant-Colonels :—Brevet Majors C. J. Otter, J. W. Reynolds, E. W. C. Wright, Maj. L. A. G. Russell, Brevet Majors A. H. Russell, J. H. C. Robertson, Majors C. H. Gordon, G. F. S. Call, R. D. Clephane, T. Harries, P. A. Butler, A. Browne, H. E. Weare, J. R. Glynn, Brev. Maj. H. M. Hamilton, Maj. T. H. Pakenham, Brev. Majors M. A. S. Biddulph, G. H. S. Willis, C. Adams, Majors Hon. A. M. Cathcart, L. Graham, Brev. Maj., J. E. Addison, Maj. J. Gwilt, Brev. Maj. H. C. C. Owen, C.B., Major W. Gordon, Brev. Major J. H. Lowndes, Majors J. E. Collings, T. Smith.

To be Majors :—Captains J. M. Macdonald, R. Bates, J. P. Pigott, H. W. Parish, R. Portal, A. A. Nelson, E. J. Blanckley, S. G. Bunbury, R. Carey, T. J. Kearney, J. P. Gore, G. W. T. Rich, A. McKinstry, H. Gray, R. Inglis, A. H. Irby, W. C. Trevor, C. R. Chichester, W. Payn, F. Hammersley, H. Walker, H.

PROMOTIONS.

Bird, R. H. Currie, W. Leckie, R. Blake-
ney, T. Hutton, G. W. H. Massey, D. J.
Gamble, E. T. Gloster, R. E. F. Crawford,
G. C. Vialls, T. Wickham, A. Alison, T.
B. Speedy, Second Captains J. Stokes,
F. Du Cane, C. H. Smith, H. F. Fitz
Hugh, F. J. Soady, J. Godby, Captains
H. R. C. Godley, G. Chetwode, F. S.
Savage, J. Perrin, Second Captain J.
Spurway, Captains C. A. B. Gordon, C.
V. Oxenden, Lieutenant and Captain R.
Gipps, Captains G. S. Whitmore, B. B.
Mauleverer, H. Roake, W. T. Tinley, T.
Tryon, H. D. O. Torrens, F. E. Drewe,
C. R. Shervington, G. F. Dallas, J. H. F.
Elkington, Second Captains N. O. S.
Turner, A. Y. Earle, Captains H. Butler,
C. Le M. Carey, C. W. St. Clair, E. A. T.
Steward, Second Captains A. Vandeleur,
R. Curtis, Captains J. M. Cuppage, A. H.
H. Mercer, T. Gore, W. H. Gillum, F. S.
Vacher, J. Ross, C. P. Bertram, C. A.
Stevenson, J. Aldridge, F. W. Balfour, A.
M. Earle, Second Captains W. P. Richards,
H. W. J. Dashwood, A. Brenden, Capt.
W. Fletcher, Second Captains J. de Havil-
land, E. G. Bredin, Capt. C. H. Bell,
Second Captain W. H. R. Simpson, Capt.
M. Walker, Second Captains G. A. Milman,
C. E. Butt, H. Irvine, S. M. Gryles,
Lient. and Capt. G. L. Goodlake.

Royal Engineers, Lieut.-Gen. Sir C. F.
Smith, K.C.B., to be Col. Commandant.

Brevet: Lieut.-Col. G. Campbell to be
Col.; Maj. L. C. A. Meyer to be Lieut.-
Col. (*hon.*); Brev. Maj. W. F. Hopkins,
Roy. M., to be Lieut.-Col.

Roy. Engineers, Lieut.-Gen. C. G. Elli-
combe, C.B., to be Col. Commandant.

Royal Art., Brevet Colonel P. Benn
to be Colonel; Brevet Major G. W. H.
Massy to substantive rank.

Brevet: Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. Lake,
C.B., Military Eng., to be Aide-de-Camp
to the Queen with rank of Colonel in the
Army; Captain J. Henley, 95th Foot, to
be Major (*hon.*); Paymaster C. South to
be Major in the Army (*hon.*).

EAST INDIAN ARMY.—On the death
of Major-General Sir W. H. Sleeman,
K.C.B., B.I., and Major General J. D.
Syers, B.I., Colonel J. Nash, C.B., B.I.,
and Colonel J. Alexander, C.B., B.I., to be
Major-Generals.

Colonel H. T. Tucker, C.B., B.I.,
to be Major-General; Lieut.-Colonels J.
Cooper, B.I., A. B. Rathbone, B.I., to be
Colonels; Major H. Seale, B.I., to be
Lieutenant-Colonel; Captain R. W. Bird,
B.I., to be Major.

On the death of Lieutenant-General

A. MacDonald, C.B., Royal Art.; Major-
General E. C. Whinyates, C.B., to be
Lieut.-General; Major-General D. R. J.
Dacres, K.C.B., Senior Supernumerary, to
fixed establishment; Colonel R. Andrews
to be Major-General (*hon.*).

On the deaths of Generals G. Wright
and J. F. Birch, Royal Engineers; Major-
General Sir H. D. Jones, K.C.B., Super-
numery, to fixed establishment; Colonel
Sir W. Reid, K.C.B., to be Major-General.

6th Dragoons, Major-General Sir J.
Jackson, K.C.B., to be Colonel.

24th Foot, Lieutenant-General Hon.
J. Finch, C.B., to be Colonel.

Royal Artillery, Lieutenant-General J.
Michell, C.B., to be Col. Commandant.

Brevet Colonel A. A. Shuttleworth
to be Colonel; Captain H. P. Christie to
be Lieutenant-Colonel; and Captain H.
Bent, Supernumerary, to be Captain.

Royal Engineers, Lieutenant-Colonel
Williams to be Colonel; Capt. S. Freeth
to be Lieutenant-Colonel.

School of Musketry at Hythe, Brevet
Lieutenant-Colonel Ernest C. Wilford to
substantive rank of Major (special case).

Brevet: On the promotion of Colonel
Sir W. Reid, K.C.B., Royal Engineers, to
be Major-General; Lieut.-Colonel J. A.
Lambert, Grenadier Guards, to be Colonel;
Major H. G. Hart, Depôt Battalion, to be
Lieut.-Colonel.

On the death of Major-General J.
Campbell, General Sir G. P. Adams, Gen.
Sir R. Ellice,—Brevet Col. J. R. Crawford,
Grenadier Guards, to be Major-General;
Lieutenant-Colonel C. F. H. Berkeley,
Scots Fusilier Guards, to be Colonel;
Brevet Major G. A. L. Blenkinsopp to be
Lieutenant-Colonel; Captain W. Fellows
to be Major.

Lieutenant-Colonel L. S. O'Connor,
1st W.I. Regt., to be Colonel.

On the death of Lieutenant-General
Paterson, R.A.,—Major-Gen. T. Hutchisson
to be Lieut.-General,—Colonel E. Sabine to
be Major-General.

On the promotion of officers of the
R.A. and R.E.,—Colonel P. Faddy, Colonel
C. Blackley, Colonel H. R. Moor, to be
Major-Generals; Col. A. Marshall, R.E.,
Col. R. S. Piper, R.E., to be Major-Generals.

Brevet: Lieutenant-General Sir J.
Burgoyne, bart., G.C.B., R.E., to be
General; Major-General Sir R. England,
G.C.B., Major-General Sir C. Campbell,
G.C.B., to be Lieutenant-Generals.

PROMOTIONS.

JULY.

Grenadier Guards, Captain and Lieut.-Colonel and Brevet Colonel Hon. A. F. Foley to be Major.

22nd Foot, Captain D. Anderson to be Major; 96th Foot, Major E. W. Scovell to be Lieutenant-Colonel.

Unattached, Brevet Major G. Mein to substantive rank (special case); Brevet Major F. E. Drewe to substantive rank.

Brevet: Brevet Colonel C. B. Cumberland to be Major-General (*hon.*); Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel W. J. Crompton to be Colonel in the Army (*hon.*).

11th Foot, Major-Gen. W. G. Cochrane to be Colonel; 52nd Foot, Major C. J. Mills to be Lieutenant-Colonel.

Brevet: Lieut.-Colonel R. G. Hughes, Lieutenant-Colonel J. Hill, R.A., to be Colonels in the Army.

Staff, Brevet Colonel E. R. Wetherall to be Deputy Quartermaster-General to the Forces.

Unattached, Brevet Major Hon. S. J. G. Calthorpe, 8th Light Dragoons, to substantive rank.

Brevet: Brevet Colonel R. G. Hughes to be Major-General (*hon.*).

EAST INDIAN ARMY.—On the death of Lieut.-General D. MacLeod, B.E., Major-General G. P. Wymer, C.B., B.I., to be Lieutenant-General; Colonel J. T. Lane, C.B., B.A., to be Major-General; Major H. FitzSimons, B.I., to be Lieutenant-Col. (*hon.*)

Royal Engineers, Capt. W. G. Hamley to be Lieut.-Colonel; Captain A. Beatty to be Lieutenant-Colonel.

Unattached, Brevet Major A. J. H. Elliot, 5th Dragoon Guards, to substantive rank.

Brevet: Colonel J. Michell, C.B., to local rank of Major-General.

AUGUST.

Brevet: Colonels W. F. Williams, unattached, R. Garrett, C. Warren, C.B., 55th Foot, Lord W. Paulet, C.B., unattached, D. A. Cameron, C.B., 42nd Foot, C. T. V. Stranbenzee, 3rd Foot, Hon. A. A. Spencer, C.B., 44th Foot, J. Lawrenson, 17th Light Dragoons, W. Parlbey, 10th Light Dragoons, A. A. T. Cunyngame, C.B., half-pay 51st Foot, C. Scollope, C.B., 62nd Foot, A. J. Lawrence, C.B., Rifle Brigade, H. Shirley, C.B., half-pay 88th Foot, R. Rumley, unattached, C. R. Sackville, Lord West, C.B., Provisional Depôt Batt., to temp. rank of Maj.-Gens.

Royal Artillery, Brevet Col. J. Hill to be Col.; Brevet Col. C. Dixon, C.B., to be Lieut.-Col.; Second Capt. E. Taswell to be Capt.; Brevet Maj. J. Singleton to be Capt. Brevet Col. R. Clarke to be Maj.-Gen. (*hon.*)

6th Dragoon Guards, Maj. W. N. Cusance to be Lieut.-Col.; Capt. C. Sawyer to be Major.

Royal Engineers, Brevet Col. J. I. Hope to be Col.; Col. J. W. Gordon to be Lieut.-Col.

Unattached, Brevet Maj. W. F. Gillum, 1st Foot, to substantive rank.

Brevet Col. T. Budgen, R.E., to be Maj.-Gen. (*hon.*)

EAST INDIAN ARMY.—On the death of Gen. Sir J. Prendergast, kt., M.I., and Gen. M. White, B.I.,—Lieut.-Gen. J. MacTrines, B.I., to be Gen.; Lieut.-General J. F. Salter, C.B., B.I., to be Gen.; Maj.-Gen. A. Dick, B.I., to be Lieut.-Gen.; Maj.-Gen. W. Pattle, C.B., B.L.Cav., to be Lieut.-Gen.; Col. G. Hutton, M.I., to be Maj.-Gen.; Col. I. Spens, B.I., to be Maj.-Gen.

Maj. J. Fulton, B.I., Maj. J. Graham, B.I., Maj. G. E. Herbert, B.L.Cav., to be Lieut.-Cols. (*hon.*)

54th Foot, Lieut.-Gen. Sir W. J. Codrington, K.C.B., to be Col.

6th Dragoon Guards, Maj. Lord G. A. Beauclerk to be Maj.

15th Foot, Maj. A. Cole to be Lieut.-Col. Brevet Lieut.-Col. H. Renny to be Col.; Lieut.-Col. G. Pinder to be Col. (*hon.*)

On the death of Gen. Sir J. Wilson, K.C.B., Gen. Earl of Cork, K.P., and Lieut.-Gen. P. Hay,—Col. W. S. Balfour, unatt., to be Maj.-Gen.; Lieut.-Col. H. Hopwood, Gren. Gds., to be Col.; Maj. H. G. Rainey, 61st Foot, to be Lieut.-Col.; Capt. S. A. Capel, 51st Foot, to be Maj.

Gen. Sir G. Brown, G.C.B., Senior Supernumerary, to fixed establishment of Generals, in succession to the vacancy occasioned by the decease of Gen. Sir G. P. Adams, Gen. R. Ellice, Gen. Sir J. Wilson, K.C.B.

Brevet Col. F. Horn, C.B., 20th Foot, to temporary rank of Maj.-Gen.

Royal Engineers, Brevet Col. R. J. Stotterd to be Col.; Capt. M. Dill to be Lieut.-Col.

20th Foot, Brevet Maj. W. P. Radcliffe to be Maj.

Unattached, Brevet Lieut.-Col. F. Whittingham, C.B., to be Lieut.-Col.; Brevet Lieut.-Col. G. Steevens, Brevet Maj. J. Gubbins to substantive rank.

PROMOTIONS.

Commissariat, Assist. Com.-Gens. M. W. Darling, W. J. T. Power, to be Dep. Com.-Gens.

Brevet Col. P. Cole to be Maj.-Gen. (*hon.*); Brevet Lieut.-Col. P. B. Reyne to be Col. (*hon.*)

SEPTEMBER.

26th Foot, Capt. W. Hopson to be Maj.; 54th Foot, Maj. R. Moffat to be Lieut.-Col.; Capt. J. C. H. Jones to be Maj.

Unattached, Brevet Maj. R. Bruce to be Maj.; Brevet Majors A. W. D. Burton, C.B., R. B. Hawley, to substantive rank.

Brevet: Brevet Col. W. Y. Moore to be Maj.-Gen. (*hon.*)

89th Foot, Capt. J. L. Philipps to be Maj.

Unattached, Brevet Lieut.-Col. F. C. Aylmer, Brevet Maj. W. Pretymann, Brevet Maj. A. Pitcairn, to substantive rank.

42nd Foot, Maj. A. Pitcairn to be Maj.; Lieut. R. Whigham to be Capt.

Unattached, Brevet Col. H. A. Lake, C.B., to be transferred from Madras Engineers to be a Lieut.-Col., unattached, in the Royal Army for services at Kars.

Brevet Majors H. R. White, A. H. P. Stuart-Wortley, to substantive rank.

Brevet: Lieut.-Col. F. Darling George to be Col.

Royal Artillery, Second Capt. and Brevet Maj. E. G. Bredin, from the supern. list, to be Second Captain.

Grenadier Guards, Capt. and Lieut.-Col. and Brevet Col. Hon. R. Bruce to be Maj.; Lieut. and Capt. J. F. Cust to be Capt. and Lieut.-Col.

Royal Engineers, Brevet Col. A. Gordon to be Col.; Capt. P. J. Gainbriggs to be Lieut.-Col.

51st Foot, Brevet Maj. A. H. Irby to be Maj.; 55th Foot, Capt. T. S. Brown to be Maj.

Unattached, Brevet Lieut.-Col. F. A. Whimper, Brevet Maj. R. Inglis, to substantive rank.

Brevet Col. E. Matson to be Maj.-Gen. (*hon.*); Lieut.-Col. R. K. Dawson to be Col.; Brevet Maj. E. D'Alton to be Lieut.-Col. (*hon.*); Brevet Col. W. R. Mansfield, unattached, to local rank of Brig.-Gen. in Poland.

Maj. J. Holmes, 12th B.N.I., Maj. R. Crewe, 45th M.N.I., to be Lieut.-Cols.

Captains G. T. S. Carruthers, E. W. Bouldier, J. E. Mayne, J. G. Stephen, J. L. Vaughan, F. J. Goldsmid, R. B.

Brett, E. Wray, R. Richardson, to be Majors in the Army.

EAST INDIAN ARMY.—Col. G. Alcock, M.A., to be Maj.-Gen.; Col. W. C. Ormsby, B.I., to be Col.; Maj. E. Clutterbuck, M.I., to be Lieut.-Col.

Capt. E. T. Erskine, B.I., Capt. A. C. Hutchinson, B.A., to be Majors.

25th Foot, Maj.-Gen. Sir H. Somerset, K.C.B., to be Col.

Unattached, Brevet Lieut.-Col. R. Warden, 19th Foot, to substantive rank; Brevet Lieut.-Col. Hon. St. G. G. Foley, C.B., unattached, to substantive rank of Maj.

Hospital Staff, Thos. Alexander, C.B., to be Insp.-Gen. of Hospitals, with local rank, in Canada.

Brevet: Maj. F. J. Griffin to be Lieut.-Col. (*hon.*)

19th Foot, Capt. G. B. Jennings to be Maj.

Depôt Battalion, Brevet Col. W. S. R. Norcott, C.B., from Rifle Brig., Lieut.-Cols. G. Dixon, C.B., from 77th Foot, A. T. Heyland, from 95th Foot, R. C. H. Taylor, from 79th Foot, A. C. Goodenough, from 34th Foot, C. Elmhirst, from 9th Foot, J. A. Street, C.B., from 57th Foot, J. W. Armstrong, from 49th Foot, J. W. S. Smith, from 38th Foot, E. A. Whitmore, from 30th Foot, E. J. V. Brown, from 88th Foot, to be Lieut.-Cols.

Brevet Lieut.-Cols. E. A. G. Muller, W. W. Turner, C.B., Majors R. Bruce, J. Rose, A. M. MacDonald, W. Rickman, J. Mason, J. Peel, M. H. Dowbiggin, W. Pretymann, R. B. Hawley, C. Hood, from half-pay unattached, to be Majors.

Unattached, Brevet Major J. Peel to substantive rank; Capt. O. B. D'Arcy, from 65th Foot, to be Major.

Brevet: On the death or promotion of Generals the Earl of Cork, Sir H. F. Campbell, Sir C. Halkett,—Lieut.-Gen. T. B. Aylmer to be General; Major-General W. G. Cochrane to be Lieutenant-General; Colonel W. Booth to be Major-General; Lieut.-Colonel H. P. Raymond to be Colonel; Major P. W. A. Bradshaw to be Lieutenant-Colonel; Captain E. C. Butler to be Major.

OCTOBER.

20th Foot, Brevet Major C. R. Butler to be Major.

Depôt Battalions, Majors R. L. Ross, from half-pay unattached, Major C. C. de Morel, from half-pay unattached, to be Majors.

Staff, Lieutenant-Colonel A. J. Herbert

PROMOTIONS.

to be Deputy Quartermaster-General to the Forces, Ionian Islands.

45th Foot, Gen. T. Brabazon Aylmer to be Colonel; 57th Foot, Major-General Sir J. F. Love, K.C.B., to be Colonel; 12th Light Dragoons, Brevet Colonel F. C. Griffiths to be Lieutenant-Colonel.

Depôt Battalions, Lieutenant-Colonel R. T. Farren, C.B., from 47th Foot, to be Lieutenant-Colonel; Major J. Lawrie from half-pay unattached, to be Major.

The Queen has been graciously pleased to direct that the corps of Royal Sappers and Miners shall henceforth be denominated the Corps of Royal Engineers, and form one body with the existing corps of Royal Engineers.

8th Light Dragoons, Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel R. de Salis to be Lieutenant-Col.; Captain A. J. Lord Killeen to be Major.

Grenadier Foot Guards, Lieutenant-Colonel A. C. Cure to be Captain and Lieutenant-Colonel.

53rd Foot, Lieutenant-Colonel G. S. Deverill to be Lieutenant-Colonel; Major J. McNeill Walter to be Lieutenant-Col.; Captain P. W. S. Ros to be Major.

Depôt Battalions, Major W. Hardy to be Major; Captain W. Daunt to be Adjutant.

Unattached, Brevet Col. R. Walpole, Major on half-pay of Rifle Brigade (late Deputy Quartermaster-General, Ionian Islands), to be Lieutenant-Colonel.

Brevet: Lieutenant-Colonel J. Watson to be Colonel (*hon.*); Lieutenant-Colonel C. How Spence, 60th Foot, to be Colonel.

EAST INDIAN ARMY.—Col. G. B. Tre-menheere, B.E., to be Major-Gen. (*hon.*); Major J. H. Mayow, B.I., Major C. R. Hobart, M.I., J. S. Freshfield, Madras Light Cavalry, to be Lieutenants.

17th Light Dragoons, Brevet Colonel A. Brown to be Lieutenant-Colonel; Major H. R. Benson to be Lieutenant-Colonel; Captain A. Learmouth to be Major.

Royal Artillery, Lieut.-Colonel E. W. Crofton to be Lieutenant-Colonel.

Royal Engineers, Brevet Colonel J. W. Gordon, C.B., to be Deputy Adjutant-General.

52nd Foot, Brevet Colonel J. L. Dennis to be Lieut.-Colonel; 94th, Lieut.-Colonel C. J. C. Mills to be Lieutenant-Colonel; 95th, Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel H. B. Harvey to be Major.

Depôt Battalion, Major V. Wing to be Major.

Depôt Battalion, Lieutenant-Colonel G. Macbeath to be Lieutenant-Colonel.

NOVEMBER.

Royal Hospital, Chelsea; General Right Hon. Sir E. Blakeney, G.C.B., to be Governor; General Sir A. Woodford, G.C.B., to be Lieutenant-Governor.

Brevet: Lieut.-Colonel B. S. Stehelin, R.E., to be Colonel; Lieutenant-Colonel F. G. A. Pinkney to be Colonel; Captain M. Macgregor, Royal Newfoundland Company, to be Major; Captain J. Middleton to be Major in the Army (*hon.*).

2nd Foot, Major-General Sir J. H. Schoedde, K.C.B., to be Colonel.

Gold Coast Corps, Brevet Major H. Bird to be Major.

On the death of Field-Marshal Viscount Hardinge, G.C.B., General Sir C. Halkett G.C.B., Lieutenant-General Sir J. Rolt, K.C.B., K.C.,—Brevet Colonel R. Greaves to be Major-General; Lieutenant-Colonel J. Alves to be Colonel; Major E. Hickey to be Lieutenant-Colonel; Captain G. R. Pole to be Major; Major-General Sir J. Outram, K.C.B., to temporary rank of Lieutenant-General, East Indies.

Scots Fusilier Guards, Lieutenant and Captain and Brevet Major E. Neville to be Captain and Lieutenant-Colonel.

Hospital Staff, John MacAndrew to be Inspector-General of Hospitals.

Brevet: Major J. J. Grant to local rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, South Africa.

DECEMBER.

Lieutenant and Brevet Captain C. T. E. Hinde, 65th B.N.I., and Lieutenant-Col. in the service of his Majesty the Sultan, to equivalent honorary rank of Lieutenant-Colonel.

Coldstream Foot Guards, Captain and Lieutenant-Colonel and Brevet Colonel W. S. Newton to be Major.

Brevet: Brevet Colonel J. Alves to be Major-General (*hon.*).

EAST INDIAN ARMY.—On the death of Lieutenant-General R. West, M.I., and Major-General W. J. Butterworth, C.B., M.I.,—Major-General T. Fiddes, B.I., to be Lieutenant-General.

To be Major-Generals:—Colonels R. Stewart, B.I., E. Pettingall, B.I., E. F. Day, B.I. (*hon.*)

To be Colonels:—Lieut.-Cols. D. F. Evans, B.I., J. C. Plowden, B.I., E. G. Austin, B.I., H. Foquet, B.I., N. H. Fishe, M.A., F. K. Duncan, B.A., J. Ramsay, B.I., J. R. Western, B.E., S. S. Trevor, M.A., W. C. Hicks, B.I.

PROMOTIONS.

To be Lieutenant-Colonels :—Majors W. C. Stather, B.I., H. W. Wood, M.I., W. V. Mitford, B.L.C., C. E. Goad, B.I., C. A. Kitson, B.C., P. Ogilvie, M.I., G. H. Fagan, B.E., D. E. Brewster, B.I.

Depôt Battalion, Lieut.-Colonel C. R. Egerton, from half-pay 89th Foot, to be Lieut.-Col.

Brevet : Lieut.-Col. D. E. MacKirdy to be Col.

12th Light Dragoons, Major-General Sir J. B. Lovell, K.C.B., to be Colonel.

74th Foot, Lieut.-Gen. C. A. Shawe to be Col.

55th Foot, Major-General the Hon. G. Anson to be Col. ; 82nd Foot, Maj.-Gen. N. Hamilton to be Col.

49th Foot, Major and Brevet Lieut.-Col. Cadwallader Adams to be Major.

Unattached, Major and Brevet Lieut.-Col. J. H. King to substantive rank ; Capt. and Brevet Lieut.-Cols. H. M. Hamilton, G. H. S. Willis, Cadwallader Adams, to substantive rank of Majors ; Captain and Brevet Majors the Hon. H. Clifford, W. H. D. Fitzgerald, H. R. Werge, A. Alison, to substantive rank.

Brevet : Lieut.-Col. S. W. Jepson to be Col.

On the death of Lieut.-Gen. Sir J. Rolt, K.B., K.C., Lieut.-Gen. A. Thompson, C.B., Gen. Sir H. J. Cumming, Lieut.-Gen. Hon. H. E. Butler,—Lieut.-Gen. Sir R. England, G.C.B., Senior Supernumerary, to fixed establishment ; Brevet Col. A. Fraser to be Major-Gen. ; Brevet Col. Lord C. Wellesley to be Maj.-Gen. ; Lieut.-Col. W. C. E. Napier to be Col. ; Major H. E. Longden to be Lieut.-Col. ; Capt. D. W. Tench to be Major.

Brevet Colonels W. F. Williams, R. Garrett, C. Warren, C.B., Lord W. Paulet, C.B., D. A. Cameron, C.B., C. Van Straubenzee, Hon. A. A. Spencer, C.B., J. Lawrenson, W. Parlbly, F. Horn, C.B., A. A. T. Cunninghame, C.B., C. Trollope, C.B., A. J. Lawrence, C.B., H. Shirley, C.B., R. Rumley, C.R.S., Lord West, C.B., to be Major-Generals (*temp.*).

EAST INDIAN ARMY.—Col. H. Hancock, B.I., to be Major-General ; Lieut.-Cols. G. S. Brown, B.I., and J. J. Hamilton, B.I., to be Colonels.

Brevet : To be Lieutenant-Colonels :—Brevet Major J. G. Rawstorne, Major R. H. Lindsell, Brevet Major T. M. Byrne, Majors J. A. V. Kirkland, J. Conolly, and F. R. Elrington, Brevet Majors T. H. Clifton and J. Turner, C.B., R.A., Majors E. W. D. Bell, R. L. Ross, R. W. Lowry, F. Spence, and E. W. Donovan, Brevet

Major J. F. M. Browne, C.B., R.E., Major R. O. Bright, Brevet Majors S. D. Broughton, R.A., W. A. Fyers, and H. A. B. Campbell, R.A., Major W. Pretymann, Brevet Majors H. R. Carden and G. L. Thomson, Major D. Watson.

To be Majors :—Captains E. E. Haines, W. Murray, R. Anderson, G. E. Baynes, H. Loftus, R. J. R. O'Connor, R. Roche, W. F. Ring, E. B. Chretien, Hon. E. S. Plunkett, H. C. Fitzgerald, H. W. Campbell, H. H. Morant, W. P. Collingwood, H. B. Scott, J. G. Crosse, F. C. Bligh, W. D. Macdonald, and T. Gilley, Lieutenants and Captains A. V. Balgonie, and R. J. Lindsay, Captains G. J. Forsyth, A. J. J. Macdonald, C. Buller, F. E. Appleyard, and H. H. Crealock.

On the death of Gen. the Hon. W. H. Gardner, R.A.,—Lieut. General R. Secker Brough to be General ; Major-General T. Dyneley, C.B., to be Lieut.-Gen. ; Major-Gen. Sir W. F. Williams, bart., K.C.B., Senior Supernumerary General Officer, to fixed establishment ; Lieut.-Gen. R. Uniacke, late R.I.A., and Lieut.-Gen. G. Irving, late R.I.A., to be generals.

Royal Artillery, Lieut.-General W. G. Power, C.B., to be Colonel Commandant.

NAVY PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS.

JANUARY.

Vice-Admiral of the Blue M. H. Dixon to a pension of 150*l.*, removed to reserved half-pay list, and Rear-Admiral of the Red Sir W. O. Pell to be Vice-Admiral of the Blue ; Rear-Admiral of the White H. W. Bruce to be Rear-Admiral of the Red ; Rear-Admiral of the Blue H. B. Martin, K.C.B., to be Rear-Admiral of the White ; Capt. the Hon. G. J. Cavendish to be Rear-Admiral on the reserved list ; Capt. C. Talbot to be Rear-Admiral of the Blue ; Commander J. E. Keaton to be Captain.

Captains W. H. Jervis to *London* ; G. K. Wilson to *Rodney* ; W. Moorsom to *Eurotas* ; F. Liardet to Greenwich Hospital ; W. J. Williams to *Centurion* ; A. C. Key to *Sanspareil* ; H. Chads to *Amphion* ; S. Osborn to *Medusa* ; T. A. B. Spratt to *Medina* ; E. B. Rice to *Leander* as Flag-Capt. to Rear-Admiral Fremantle. —Commanders the Hon. F. A. Foley to *Brunswick* ; C. W. Hope to *Prometheus* ; J. W. Whyte to *Centurion* ; W. M'Dowell

PROMOTIONS.

to *Rodney*; W. T. Bate to *Mariner*; F. Moresby to *Sappho*; A. Mansell to *Tartarus*; M'Leod B. Cockraft to *Agamemnon*.

FEBRUARY.

Admiral of the Blue Sir James Alexander Gordon, G.C.B., Vice-Admiral of the Blue Sir Watkin O. Pell, and Rear-Admiral of the Red Sir William Carroll, K.C.B., to reserved list; Vice-Admiral of the Red Sir T. J. Cochrane, K.C.B., to be Admiral of the Blue; Vice-Admiral of the White Charles S. J. Hawtayne to be Vice-Admiral of the Red; Vice-Admiral of the Blue Henry Prescott, C.B., to be Vice-Admiral of the White; Rear-Admiral Sir A. P. Green, K.C.H., on the reserved list, to be Vice-Admiral on the reserved list; Rear-Admiral of the Red W. B. Mends to be Vice-Admiral of the Blue; Rear-Admiral G. Ferguson, on the reserved list, to be Vice-Admiral on the reserved list; Rear-Admiral of the Red Sir G. R. Sartorius to be Vice-Admiral of the Blue; Rear-Adms. of the White W. J. Mingaye, Sir J. H. Plumridge, K.C.B., Sir T. Herbert, K.C.B., to be Rear-Admirals of the Red; Rear-Admirals of the Blue H. Eden, F. W. Beechey, J. Scott, C.B., to be Rear-Adms. of the White.—Captains T. W. Carter, C.B., Sir T. S. Pasley, bart., to be Rear-Adms. of the Blue.

Captain Sir J. Handmarsh, K.H., to be Rear-Admiral on the reserved list; Captain Christopher Wyvill to be Rear-Admiral of the Blue.

Commanders H. Coryton, J. B. Marsh, W. C. Chamberlain, and M. S. Nolloth, to be Captains.

Rear-Admirals the Honorable Sir R. S. Dundas to command Baltic Fleet; L. Baynes to *Retribution*.—Captains the Hon. F. Pelham to be Captain of the Fleet; H. J. Codrington, C.B., to *Algiers*.—Commanders S. G. Cresswell to *Sparrowhawk*; J. M'Neil Boyd to *Algiers*; W. Mould to *Royal George*; E. W. Turnour (Lieut.) to *Colossus*; G. F. Burgess to *Stromboli*; G. P. Mends to *Pioneer*; T. Saumarez to *Lapwing*; J. S. Josling to *James Watt*; F. A. Close to *Mohawk*; W. A. Pearse to *London*; T. Macnamara to *St. Vincent*; W. Horton to *Curlew*; T. Cochrane to *Conflict*; J. De Conrey A. Agnew to *Frolic*; W. E. A. Gordon to *Hermes*.

MARCH.

Commanders A. B. Becher and J. Thompson to be Captains on the reserved list; C. P. Coles to be Captain.

Commander Thompson to be Captain on the retired list.

Marines, Captain E. P. H. Ussher to be Major.

Rear-Admiral Sir H. D. Chads, K.C.B., to command Cork Station.—Captains G. Goldsmith, C.B., to be Superintendent of Chatham Yard; H. Eyres, C.B., to *Exmouth*; the Hon. J. R. Drummond to *Victory*; C. O. Hayes to *Leopard*; Hon. J. W. S. Spencer to *Firebrand*; E. A. Inglefield to *Sidon*.—Commanders R. D. Aldrich to *Waterloo*; J. A. Mends to *Waterloo*; G. F. Burgess to *Stromboli*; J. E. Commerell to *Snake*; T. N. T. Saulez to *Ringdove*; W. Bowden to *Cor-morant*; J. W. D. McDonald to *Perseverance*; E. Wilson to *Wellesley*; H. C. Magendie to *Alacrity*; W. G. Jones to *Assurance*; H. J. Bloomfield to *Osprey*; C. E. H. Vernon to *Surprise*; W. Armitage to *Vigilant*; E. Chambers to *Driver*.

MAY.

On the death of Rear-Adm. of the White Lord Adolphus Fitzclarence, G.C.H.

Rear-Adm. of the Blue W. Sandon to be Rear-Adm. of the White; Captain C. H. Williams, Rear-Adm. reserved list; Captain H. F. Greville, C.B., Rear-Adm. of the Blue; Retired Captains A. A. Vincent, K.H., and S. Radford, K.H., Retired Rear-Adms.

To be Captains, Commanders R. B. Crawford, R. D. White, A. H. Gardner, J. O. Johnson, W. S. Pullen, J. McNeill Boyd, H. G. H. Douglas, G. L. G. Bowyer, J. Dirom, H. Croft, F. A. B. Craufurd, G. O. Willis, G. Ogle, and H. G. Morris.

Captains N. Vansittart to *Magicienne*; Hon. A. Cochrane to *Niger*; Hon. J. Pelham to *Blenheim*; H. C. Otter to *Porcupine*; T. J. Anson to *James Watt*.

Commanders E. Chambers to *Driver*; G. W. Towsey to *Gorgon*; C. L. Waddilove to *Swallow*; S. H. Henderson to *Arrow*; J. H. Marryat to *Wrangler*; T. Goss, Agent of Transports at Malta; G. M. Jackson, *Desperate*; H. Campion to *Falcon*; J. H. Ferneaux to *Vulcan*; C. A. Wise to *Weser*; R. B. Oldfield to *Lynx*; J. D. M'Cree to *Algiers*; T. Hunt to

PROMOTIONS.

Electra; J. F. C. Hamilton to *Elk*; A. W. A. Hood to *Acorn*; H. V. Haggard to *Virago*; T. M. S. Pasley to *Atalanta*; R. B. Pearse to *Arab*; E. Brnstal, additional Commander of *Fisgard*.

JUNE.

Commanders A. H. Ingram, E. Dixon, J. Steane, W. Worsfold, C. Gayton, H. Dumares, W. Ellis, T. Smith, J. G. Mackenzie, and J. R. Woodriff to be Captains, reserved list.

Captains F. Hutton to *Royal William*; J. A. Paynter to *Brilliant*.

Commanders G. F. Day to *Firefly*; C. W. Buckley to *Merlin*; H. T. Kantzow to *Brunswick*; C. H. Scott to Coast Guard; J. M. Langtry to *Blenheim*; H. Lloyd to *Formidable*.

In reference to the announcement contained in the *London Gazette*, January 22, 1856, that the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty would proceed within three months from that date to adjudicate upon the claim preferred by Dr. James Rae, under the third paragraph of their proclamation of March 7, 1850, by which the sum of 10,000*l.* was offered to any party or parties who, in the judgment of the Board of Admiralty, should first succeed in ascertaining the fate of the expedition under the command of Sir John Franklin; and that all persons who, by virtue of such proclamation, deemed themselves entitled to the whole or any part of the reward in question, must prefer their claim within such time;

The Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty hereby declare, that they have duly considered all claims preferred by persons deeming themselves entitled under such proclamation to the said rewards therein specified, and have determined Dr. James Rae to be entitled, on behalf of himself and companions in his expedition, to the reward of 10,000*l.* under the terms of the third paragraph of such proclamation as aforesaid.

JULY.

Royal Marines, Capt. J. G. A. Ayles to be Lieut.-Col.; First Lieut. W. P. Draffen to be Captain.

Brevet: Lieut.-Col. P. T. Murray Payne to be Col. (*hon.*); Lieut.-Colonel J. C. G. Courtis to be Col. (*hon.*); Capt. A. S. S. Walsh to be Lieut.-Col.

Captains H. C. Yelverton to *Conqueror*;

G. Giffard to *Brunswick*; S. Grenfell to *Amethyst*.

Commanders G. T. Colville to *Camilla*; R. H. Risk to *Ajax*; F. H. C. Glyn to *Coquette*; J. M. Langtry to *Wellesley*; G. H. Gardner to *Blenheim*; F. H. Stirling to *Wasp*.

Vice-Adm. of the Blue Peter J. Douglas to a pension of 150*l.* per ann.; Rear-Adm. of the Red R. Wauchope to be Vice-Adm. of the Blue; Rear-Admiral of the White Hon. H. J. Rous to be Rear-Adm. of the Red; Rear-Adm. of the Blue G. W. C. Courtenay to be Rear-Admiral of the White.

Capt. T. M. Laws and Sir B. Macnamara to be Rear-Adm. on the reserved list; Capt. Right Hon. Lord G. Paulet, C.B., to be Rear-Adm. of the Blue; Capt. J. Harrison to be a retired Rear-Adm. of the Blue.

AUGUST.

Commanders E. Peirse, J. M'D. Skene, and S. S. L. Crofton, to be Captains.

Captains R. S. Hewlett, C.B., to *Cambridge*; E. P. Halstead to *Edinburgh*; G. Giffard to *Princes Royal*; H. Broadhead to *Brunswick*; C. F. A. Shadwell to *Highflyer*.

Commanders G. A. Phayre to *Basilisk*; J. Corbett to *Inflexible*; Charles Fellowes to *Cruiser*; C. T. Leckie to *Fury*; H. J. Raby to *Medusa*; W. T. Bate to *Actæon*; H. P. De Kantzow to *Conqueror*; J. S. A. Dennis to *Cæsar*; J. Eyde to *Brunswick*; H. Lloyd to *Edinburgh*; C. S. S. Stanhope to *Royal Albert*; L. B. Cockcraft to *Princess Royal*; W. Mould to *Majestic*; F. A. Cudlip to *Fisgard*.

SEPTEMBER.

Captains C. Barker to *Retribution*; Hon. H. Keppel to *Raleigh*; W. Peel, C.B., to *Shannon*.

Commanders J. S. Rundel to *Brunswick*; E. Leicester to *Madagascar*.

Lieut.-Commander T. B. Collinson to *Bustard*.

OCTOBER.

Captains T. S. Thompson to *Colossus*; J. Prevost to *Satellite*.

Commanders E. W. Turnour to *Raleigh*; J. Elye to *Colossus*.

PROMOTIONS.

NOVEMBER.

Vice-Admiral of the Blue W. Bowen Mends to a pension of 150*l.* per annum, removed to reserved half-pay list; Rear-Adm. of the Red Sir J. G. Sinclair, bart., to be Vice-Adm. of the Blue; Rear-Adm. of the White G. F. Rich to be Rear-Adm. of the Red; Rear-Admiral of the Blue Hon. F. W. Grey, C.B., to be Rear-Adm. of the White; Captain Right Hon. Lord E. Russell, C.B., to be Rear-Admiral of the Blue.

On the death of Vice-Admiral of the Red H. J. Percy, C.B.; Vice-Admiral of the White Sir J. W. D. Dundas, G.C.B., to be Vice-Admiral of the Red; Vice-Admiral of the Blue E. Harvey to be Vice-Admiral of the White; Rear-Admiral G. E. Watts, C.B., and Rear-Admiral H. O. Grady to be Vice-Admirals on the reserved list; Rear-Admiral of the Red Right Hon. Sir M. F. F. Berkeley, K.C.B., to be Vice-Admiral of the Blue; Rear-Admiral of the White W. J. Hope Johnstone to be Rear-Admiral of the Red; Rear-Admiral of the Blue R. L. Baynes, C.B., to be Rear-Adm. of the White; Captain H. W. Bayfield to be Rear-Admiral of the Blue.

Captains H. S. Marsham, C. Crowdy, and T. Mansel to be retired Admirals on terms, *London Gazette*, 1st September, 1846.

Captain R. Craigie to be Superintendent of the Royal William Victualling Yard and Royal Plymouth Hospital.

DECEMBER.

Vice-Admiral of the Blue Hon. G. A. Crofton to a pension of 150*l.* per annum, removed to reserved half-pay list; Rear-Admiral Sir D. Dunn, K.C.H., to be Vice-Admiral; Rear-Admiral of the Red Sir F. Moresby, K.C.B., to be Vice-Admiral of the Blue; Rear-Admiral of the White W. Fanshawe Martin to be Rear-Admiral of the Red; Rear-Admiral of the Blue T. Bennet to be Rear-Admiral of the White; Captain Hon. G. Grey to be Rear-Admiral of the Blue.

Captain W. T. Dance to be Retired Rear-Admiral, on terms, *London Gazette*, 1st September, 1846.

On the death of Rear-Admiral of the White F. W. Beechey, Rear-Admiral of the Blue Peter Richards, C.B., to be Rear-Admiral of the White; Captain the Most Hon. John Marquess Townsend to be Rear-Admiral on reserved half-pay; Capt.

the Hon. Arthur Duncombe to be Rear-Admiral on reserved half-pay; Captain Sir J. C. Ross to be Rear-Admiral of the Blue.

Captain W. Hamley to be Retired Rear-Admiral on terms, *London Gazette*, 1st September, 1846.

Brevet Captain J. Aslett to be Major (*hon.*).

Commanders A. Haseltine, C. R. Johnson, G. J. Napier to be Captains (active list); W. Hoseason, J. B. Cragg, S. Booth, S. Reynolds to be Captains (reserved list).

Rear-Admiral Sir H. Stewart, K.C.B., to be Commander-in-Chief in the West Indies and North America.

Captains G. Richards to *Plumper*; L. G. Heath to *Melampus*; H. A. Stovy to *Eagle*; Wilcox to *Hawke*; Hon. J. Drummond to *Mæander*; E. O. Charlewood to *Southampton*; R. A. Powell to *Cornwallis*; J. Fraser to *Pembroke*; F. Warden, C.B., to be Naval Officer Gibraltar.

Commanders J. M. Cooke to *Simoom*; G. T. M. Purvis to *Megara*; R. T. Bedford to *Royal William*; F. A. Close to *Trident*; C. Wake to *Indus*; R. G. Hore to *Dasher*.

ECCLESIASTICAL PREFERENCES.

Rev. J. Gregg to be Dean of Down, Ireland.

Rev. J. H. Stephenson to be an Hon. Canon in the Cathedral Church of Wells.

Ven. M. B. Hale to be Bishop of Perth, Western Australia.

Rev. T. H. Braim to be Archdeacon of Portland, Melbourne, Australia.

Rev. D. Bruce to be an Hon. Canon in the Cathedral Church of Durham.

Rev. F. C. Cook to be a Prebendary of St. Paul's.

Rev. J. G. Cromwell to be an Hon. Canon in Durham Cathedral.

Rev. T. B. Power to be Prebend of Moreton Parva, Hereford.

Hon. and Rev. H. M. Villiers, D.D., to be Lord Bishop of Carlisle.

Ven. R. Courtenay to be Coadjutor to the Bishop of Jamaica, under the name and style of the Bishop of Kingston.

Rev. J. S. M. Anderson to be an Hon. Canon in the Cathedral Church of Bristol.

Rev. W. R. Colbeck to be an Hon.

PROMOTIONS.

Canon in the Cathedral Church of Norwich.

Rev. M. Gibbs to be Prebendary of Finsbury in St. Paul's Cathedral.

Rev. C. Marshal to be a Prebendary in St. Paul's Cathedral.

Rev. H. Melvill to be a Residentiary Canon in St. Paul's Cathedral.

Very Rev. T. Woodward to be Dean of Down, Ireland.

Rev. R. H. Cobbold to be an Archdeacon in the diocese of Victoria.

Rev. W. B. Heathcote to be Prebendary of Winterbourne Earls, in Salisbury Cathedral.

Rev. H. J. C. Harper to be Bishop of Christ Church, New Zealand.

Rev. R. W. Evans to be Archdeacon of Westmoreland.

Rev. J. Jones to be an Hon. Canon in the Cathedral Church of Bangor.

Rev. F. Meyrick to be one of Her Majesty's Preachers in the Chapel Royal, Whitehall.

Rev. M. Cowie to be a Minor Canon in St. Paul's Cathedral.

Rev. C. Williams to be an Hon. Canon in the Cathedral Church of Bangor.

Rev. D. Williams to be an Hon. Canon in the Cathedral Church of Bangor.

Rev. C. Baring, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, to be Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

Rev. H. N. Birch, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, to be an Hon. Canon in the Cathedral Church of Manchester.

Rev. W. Dalton to be Prebendary of Sandiacre, in the Cathedral Church of Lichfield.

Rev. H. B. Foster to be an Hon. Canon in Gloucester Cathedral.

Rev. W. L. Hussey to be an Hon. Canon in the Cathedral Church of Manchester.

Ven. M. J. Keatinge to be Dean of Kilfenora, Ireland.

Rev. S. M. Lakin to be a Minor Canon in the Cathedral Church of Salisbury.

Rev. G. F. Goddard to be an Hon. Canon in Rochester Cathedral.

Rev. E. C. Harington to be a Residentiary Canon in Exeter Cathedral.

Rev. F. Lear to be Prebendary in Salisbury Cathedral.

Rev. G. F. Lewis to be a Residentiary Canon in the Cathedral Church of Worcester.

Rev. H. Cotterill to be Lord Bishop of Graham's Town in Cape Colony and British Caffraria.

Rev. J. Guthrie to be a Residentiary Canon, Salisbury.

Rev. R. Collyer to be an Hon. Canon in the Cathedral Church of Norwich.

Rev. W. K. Marshall to be a Canon in the Cathedral Church of Hereford.

Rev. J. Mathews to be an Hon. Canon in the Cathedral Church of St. David's.

Rev. F. Temple to be one of the Chaplains in Ordinary to Her Majesty.

Right Rev. C. T. Longley to be Lord Bishop of Durham.

Very Rev. A. Campbell Tait to be Lord Bishop of London.

Rev. C. F. Smith to be a Prebendary in Exeter Cathedral.

Rev. R. C. Trench to be Dean of Westminster.

Rev. W. Poole to be Prebendary of Church Withington, in Hereford Cathedral.

Rev. R. Bickersteth to be Lord Bishop of Ripon.

Rev. J. Antrobus to be a Minor Canon in Westminster Abbey.

Rev. W. Fry to be an Hon. Canon in Peterborough Cathedral.

Rev. H. Howel to be an Hon. Canon in Norwich Cathedral.

Rev. O. W. Moore to be Dean of Cashel, Ireland.

Rev. Lord Alwyne Compton to be an Hon. Canon in Peterborough Cathedral.

Rev. R. Sorsbie to be a Minor Canon in the Cathedral Church of Rochester.

Rev. C. A. Swainson to be a Prebendary of the Chichester Cathedral.

Ven. W. Fitzgerald, D.D., to be Lord Bishop of Cork, Cloyne, and Ross.

Rev. J. H. Gurney to be an Hon. Canon in St. Paul's Cathedral.

COLLEGIATE AND SCHOLASTIC.

The Rev. G. Robinson Moncrieff, M.A., to be one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools.

Rev. W. Bevern Grix to be Head Master of the Congleton Free Grammar School, Cheshire.

Rev. J. Macintosh to be Master of the Cathedral Grammar School, Bristol.

Rev. J. Ellis to be Head Master of the Cathedral Grammar School, Salisbury.

Rev. R. Fowler to be Mathematical Master of the Tunbridge School, Kent.

Rev. C. Scott to be one of the Assistant

PROMOTIONS.

Masters in Classics and Mathematics, Merchant Taylors' School, London.

Rev. E. D. Ward to be Principal of the Collegiate School, Sheffield.

Rev. T. R. Laugharne to be Head Master of St. John's Royal Latin School, Buckingham.

Rev. W. L. Mason to be Superintendent to the Government Schools, Mauritius.

Rev. F. Tearle to be Head Master of the Free Grammar School, Kettering, Northamptonshire.

Rev. S. Trueman to be Head Master of the Free Grammar School, Ormskirk, Lancashire.

Rev. R. Caley to be a Classical Master, King Edward's School, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk.

Rev. W. J. Vernon to be Vice Principal of Blackheath College, Kent.

Rev. J. Gwynn to be Warden of St. Columba's College, Ireland.

Rev. J. H. Leach to be Head Classical Master of Grosvenor College, Bath.

Rev. W. Scott to be Astronomer at Sydney, New South Wales.

Rev. G. B. Dodwell to be Master of the Grammar School, Chipping Campden, Gloucestershire.

Rev. W. Hodgson to be Principal of the Theological College, Sydney, New South Wales.

Rev. R. E. Hughes to be one of Her Majesty's Assistant Inspectors of Schools.

Rev. J. Prior to be Vice Principal and Head Classical Master of Sydney College, Bath.

Rev. W. H. Milman to be a Librarian of Zion College, London.

Rev. W. Leeman to be Master of the Grammar School, Billericay, Essex.

Rev. R. Deodatus Harris to be Head Master of the High School, Hobart Town, Tasmania.

Rev. W. Banks to be Head Master of the

Royal Grammar School of King Edward at Morpeth, Northumberland.

Rev. T. C. Durham to be Head Master of the Grammar School, Berwick-upon-Tweed.

Rev. D. Bellamy to be Head Master of the Grammar School, Rishworth, near Halifax, Yorkshire.

Rev. T. Gwynn to be Head Master of Aylesbury Grammar School, Bucks.

Rev. H. Linthwaite to be a Head Master of Wilton Grammar School, Cheshire.

Mr. E. B. Cowell to be Professor of Modern History and Political Economy in the Presidency College of Calcutta.

Assistant-Surgeon G. Liebig to be Professor of Natural History and Geology in the Presidency College, East Indies.

Colonel Wilford to be Governor of the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich.

The Earl of Ellesmere to be Lord Rector of King's College, Aberdeen.

Sir E. Bulwer Lytton to be Lord Rector of Glasgow University.

Rev. A. P. Stanley to be Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford.

The Earl Granville to be Chancellor of the University of London.

Dr. T. Mayo to be President of the Royal College of Physicians.

Sir H. D. Jones to be Governor of Sandhurst Military College.

Mr. Ferguson to be Examiner in Surgery at the London University.

Mr. T. H. Huxley to be Examiner in Comparative Anatomy and Physiology in the University of London.

Mr. G. Busk to be Hunterian Professor of Comparative Anatomy and Physiology in the Royal College of Surgeons of England.

Professor Fraser to be Professor of Logic in the University of Edinburgh.

STATE PAPERS.

TREATIES.

I.—INTERNATIONAL.

I.—GENERAL TREATY BETWEEN
HER MAJESTY, THE EMPEROR OF
AUSTRIA, THE EMPEROR OF THE
FRENCH, THE KING OF PRUSSIA,
THE EMPEROR OF RUSSIA, THE
KING OF SARDINIA, AND THE
SULTAN.

*Signed at Paris, March 30, 1856.
Ratifications exchanged at Paris,
April 27, 1856.*

(Translation.)

In the Name of Almighty God.

Their Majesties the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Emperor of the French, the Emperor of all the Russias, the King of Sardinia, and the Emperor of the Ottomans, animated by the desire of putting an end to the calamities of war, and wishing to prevent the return of the complications which occasioned it, resolved to come to an understanding with His Majesty the Emperor of Austria as to the bases on which peace might be re-established and consolidated, by securing, through effectual and reciprocal guarantees, the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire.

For this purpose, Their said Majesties named as their Plenipotentiaries, that is to say:

Her Majesty the Queen of the

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Right Honourable George William Frederick Earl of Clarendon, Baron Hyde of Hindon, a Peer of the United Kingdom, a Member of Her Britannic Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, Knight of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; and the Right Honourable Henry Richard Charles Baron Cowley, a Peer of the United Kingdom, a Member of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Her Majesty's Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to His Majesty the Emperor of the French;

His Majesty the Emperor of Austria, the Sieur Charles Ferdinand Count of Buol-Schauenstein, Grand Cross of the Imperial Order of Leopold of Austria, and Knight of the Order of the Iron Crown of the first class, Grand Cross of the Imperial Order of the Legion of Honour, Knight of the Orders of the Black Eagle and of the Red Eagle of Prussia, Grand Cross of the Imperial Orders of Alexander Newski, in diamonds, and of the White Eagle of Russia, Grand Cross of the Order

of St. John of Jerusalem, decorated with the Imperial Order of the Medjidie of the first class, &c., &c., His Chamberlain and actual Privy Councillor, His Minister of the House and of Foreign Affairs, President of the Conference of Ministers ; and the Sieur Joseph Alexander Baron de Hübner, Grand Cross of the Imperial Order of the Iron Crown, Grand Officer of the Imperial Order of the Legion of Honour, His actual Privy Councillor, and His Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Court of France ;

His Majesty the Emperor of the French, the Sieur Alexander Count Colonna Walewski, a Senator of the Empire, Grand Officer of the Imperial Order of the Legion of Honour, Knight Grand Cross of the Equestrian Order of the Seraphim, Grand Cross of the Order of St. Maurice and St. Lazarus, decorated with the Imperial Order of the Medjidie of the first class, &c., &c., His Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs ; and the Sieur Francis Adolphus Baron de Bourqueney, Grand Cross of the Imperial Order of the Legion of Honour and of the Order of Leopold of Austria, decorated with the Portrait of the Sultan in diamonds, &c., &c., His Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to His Imperial and Royal Apostolic Majesty ;

His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, the Sieur Alexis Count Orloff, His Aide-de-camp General and General of Cavalry, Commander of the Head-Quarters of His Majesty, a Member of the Council of the Empire and of the Committee of Ministers, decorated with two Portraits in diamonds of Their Majesties the late Emperor

Nicholas and the Emperor Alexander II., Knight of the Order of St. Andrew in diamonds, and of the Orders of Russia, Grand Cross of the Order of St. Stephen of Austria of the first class, of the Black Eagle of Prussia in diamonds, of the Annunciation of Sardinia, and of several other foreign Orders ; and the Sieur Philip, Baron de Brunnow, His Privy Councillor, His Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Germanic Confederation and to the Grand Duke of Hesse, Knight of the Orders of St. Wladimir of the first class, of St. Alexander Newski, enriched with diamonds, of the White Eagle, of Saint Anne, of the first class, of St. Stanislaus of the first class, Grand Cross of the Order of the Red Eagle of Prussia of the first class, Commander of the Order of St. Stephen of Austria, and of several other foreign Orders ;

His Majesty the King of Sardinia, the Sieur Camille Benso, Count of Cavour, Grand Cross of the Order of St. Maurice and St. Lazarus, Knight of the Order of Civil Merit of Savoy, Grand Cross of the Imperial Order of the Legion of Honour, decorated with the Imperial Order of the Medjidie of the first class, Grand Cross of several other foreign Orders, President of the Council of Ministers, and His Minister Secretary of State for the Finances ; and the Sieur Salvator Marquis de Villamarina, Grand Cross of the Order of St. Maurice and St. Lazarus, Grand Officer of the Imperial Order of the Legion of Honour, &c., &c., His Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Court of France ;

And His Majesty the Emperor of the Ottomans, Mouhammed

Emin Aali Pasha, Grand Vizier of the Ottoman Empire, decorated with the Imperial Orders of the Medjidie and of Merit of the first class, Grand Cross of the Imperial Order of the Legion of Honour, of St. Stephen of Austria, of the Red Eagle of Prussia, of St. Anne of Russia, of St. Maurice and St. Lazarus of Sardinia, of the Polar Star of Sweden, and of several other foreign Orders; and Mehemmed Djemil Bey, decorated with the Imperial Order of the Medjidie of the second class, and Grand Cross of the Order of St. Maurice and St. Lazarus, His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to His Majesty the Emperor of the French, accredited in the same character to His Majesty the King of Sardinia;

Which Plenipotentiaries assembled in Congress at Paris.

An understanding having been happily established between them, Their Majesties the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Emperor of Austria, the Emperor of the French, the Emperor of all the Russias, the King of Sardinia, and the Emperor of the Ottomans, considering that, in the interest of Europe, His Majesty the King of Prussia, a signing Party to the Convention of the 13th of July, 1841, should be invited to participate in the new arrangements to be adopted, and appreciating the value that the concurrence of His said Majesty would add to a work of general pacification, invited him to send Plenipotentiaries to the Congress.

In consequence, His Majesty the King of Prussia named as his Plenipotentiaries, that is to say:

The Sieur Otho Theodore Baron de Manteuffel, President of His

Council, and His Minister for Foreign Affairs, Knight of the Red Eagle of Prussia of the first class, with Oak-leaves, Crown, and Sceptre, Grand Commander of the Order of Hohenzollern, Knight of the Order of St. John of Prussia, Grand Cross of the Order of St. Stephen of Hungary, Knight of the Order of St. Alexander Newski, Grand Cross of the Order of St. Maurice and St. Lazarus, and of the Order of the Nichan-Iftihar of Turkey, &c., &c., &c.; and the Sieur Maximilian Frederick Charles Francis Count of Hatzfeldt Wildenburg-Schoenstein, His actual Privy Councillor, His Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Court of France, Knight of the Order of the Red Eagle of Prussia of the second class, with Oak-leaves and Badge, Knight of the Cross of Honour of Hohenzollern of the first class, &c., &c., &c.

The Plenipotentiaries, after having exchanged their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:—

Art. I. From the day of the exchange of the ratifications of the present Treaty, there shall be peace and friendship between Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, His Majesty the Emperor of the French, His Majesty the King of Sardinia, His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, on the one part, and His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, on the other part; as well as between their heirs and successors, their respective dominions and subjects, in perpetuity.

Art. II. Peace being happily re-established between their said Majesties, the territories conquered

or occupied by their armies during the war shall be reciprocally evacuated.

Special arrangements shall regulate the mode of the evacuation, which shall be as prompt as possible.

Art. III. His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias engages to restore to His Majesty the Sultan the town and citadel of Kars, as well as the other parts of the Ottoman territory of which the Russian troops are in possession.

Art. IV. Their Majesties the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Emperor of the French, the King of Sardinia, and the Sultan, engage to restore to His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, the towns and ports of Sebastopol, Balaklava, Kamiesch, Eupatoria, Kertch, Jenikale, Kinburn, as well as all other territories occupied by the allied troops.

Art. V. Their Majesties the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Emperor of the French, the Emperor of all the Russias, the King of Sardinia, and the Sultan, grant a full and entire amnesty to those of their subjects who may have been compromised by any participation whatsoever in the events of the war in favour of the cause of the enemy.

It is expressly understood that such amnesty shall extend to the subjects of each of the belligerent parties who may have continued, during the war, to be employed in the service of one of the other belligerents.

Art. VI. Prisoners of war shall be immediately given up on either side.

Art. VII. Her Majesty the

Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, His Majesty the Emperor of Austria, His Majesty the Emperor of the French, His Majesty the King of Prussia, His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, and His Majesty the King of Sardinia, declare the Sublime Porte admitted to participate in the advantages of the public law and system (*concert*) of Europe. Their Majesties engage, each on his part, to respect the independence and the territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire; guarantee in common the strict observance of that engagement, and will, in consequence, consider any act tending to its violation as a question of general interest.

Art. VIII. If there should arise between the Sublime Porte and one or more of the other signing Powers, any misunderstanding which might endanger the maintenance of their relations, the Sublime Porte, and each of such Powers, before having recourse to the use of force, shall afford the other Contracting Parties the opportunity of preventing such an extremity by means of their mediation.

Art. IX. His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, having, in his constant solicitude for the welfare of his subjects, issued a firman which, while ameliorating their condition without distinction of religion or of race, records his generous intentions towards the Christian population of his empire, and wishing to give a further proof of his sentiments in that respect, has resolved to communicate to the Contracting Parties the said firman, emanating spontaneously from his sovereign will.

The Contracting Powers recognize the high value of this commu-

nication. It is clearly understood that it cannot, in any case, give to the said Powers the right to interfere, either collectively or separately, in the relations of His Majesty the Sultan with his subjects, nor in the internal administration of his empire.

Art. X. The Convention of the 13th of July, 1841, which maintains the ancient rule of the Ottoman Empire relative to the closing of the Straits of the Bosphorus and of the Dardanelles, has been revised by common consent.

The Act concluded for that purpose, and in conformity with that principle, between the High Contracting Parties, is and remains annexed to the present Treaty, and shall have the same force and validity as if it formed an integral part thereof.

Art. XI. The Black Sea is neutralized: its waters and its ports, thrown open to the mercantile marine of every nation, are formally and in perpetuity interdicted to the flag of war, either of the Powers possessing its coasts, or of any other Power, with the exceptions mentioned in Articles XIV. and XIX. of the present Treaty.

Art. XII. Free from any impediment, the commerce in the ports and waters of the Black Sea shall be subject only to regulations of health, customs, and police, framed in a spirit favourable to the development of commercial transactions.

In order to afford to the commercial and maritime interests of every nation the security which is desired, Russia and the Sublime Porte will admit Consuls into their ports situated upon the coast of the Black Sea, in conformity with the principles of international law.

Art. XIII. The Black Sea

being neutralized according to the terms of Article XI., the maintenance or establishment upon its coast of military-maritime arsenals becomes alike unnecessary and purposeless; in consequence, His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias and His Imperial Majesty the Sultan engage not to establish or to maintain upon that coast any military-maritime arsenal.

Art. XIV. Their Majesties the Emperor of all the Russias and the Sultan having concluded a Convention for the purpose of settling the force and the number of light vessels necessary for the service of their coasts which they reserve to themselves to maintain in the Black Sea, that Convention is annexed to the present Treaty, and shall have the same force and validity as if it formed an integral part thereof. It cannot be either annulled or modified without the assent of the Powers signing the present Treaty.

Art. XV. The Act of the Congress of Vienna having established the principles intended to regulate the navigation of rivers which separate or traverse different States, the Contracting Powers stipulate among themselves that those principles shall in future be equally applied to the Danube and its mouths. They declare that this arrangement henceforth forms a part of the public law of Europe, and take it under their guarantee.

The navigation of the Danube cannot be subjected to any impediment or charge not expressly provided for by the stipulations contained in the following Articles: in consequence, there shall not be levied any toll founded solely upon the fact of the navigation of the river, nor any duty upon the goods which may be on board of vessels.

The regulations of police and of quarantine to be established for the safety of the States separated or traversed by that river shall be so framed as to facilitate as much as possible, the passage of vessels. With the exception of such regulations, no obstacle whatever shall be opposed to free navigation.

Art. XVI. With the view to carry out the arrangements of the preceding Article, a Commission, in which Great Britain, Austria, France, Prussia, Russia, Sardinia, and Turkey, shall each be represented by one delegate, shall be charged to designate and to cause to be executed the works necessary below Isatcha, to clear the mouths of the Danube, as well as the neighbouring parts of the sea, from the sands and other impediments which obstruct them, in order to put that part of the river and the said parts of the sea in the best possible state for navigation.

In order to cover the expenses of such works, as well as of the establishments intended to secure and to facilitate the navigation at the mouths of the Danube, fixed duties, of a suitable rate, settled by the Commission by a majority of votes, may be levied, on the express condition that, in this respect as in every other, the flags of all nations shall be treated on the footing of perfect equality.

Art. XVII. A Commission shall be established, and shall be composed of delegates of Austria, Bavaria, the Sublime Porte, and Wurtemberg (one for each of those Powers), to whom shall be added Commissioners from the three Danubian Principalities, whose nomination shall have been approved by the Porte. This Commission, which shall be permanent: 1. Shall prepare regulations of navi-

gation and of river police; 2. Shall remove the impediments, of whatever nature they may be, which still prevent the application to the Danube of the arrangements of the Treaty of Vienna; 3. Shall order and cause to be executed the necessary works throughout the whole course of the river; and 4. Shall, after the dissolution of the European Commission, see to maintaining the mouths of the Danube and the neighbouring parts of the sea in a navigable state.

Art. XVIII. It is understood that the European Commission shall have completed its task, and that the River Commission shall have finished the works described in the preceding Article, under Nos. 1 and 2, within the period of two years. The signing Powers assembled in Conference having been informed of that fact, shall, after having placed it on record, pronounce the dissolution of the European Commission, and from that time the permanent River Commission shall enjoy the same powers as those with which the European Commission shall until then have been invested.

Art. XIX. In order to insure the execution of the regulations which shall have been established by common agreement, in conformity with the principles above declared, each of the Contracting Powers shall have the right to station, at all times, two light vessels at the mouths of the Danube.

Art. XX. In exchange for the towns, ports, and territories enumerated in Article IV. of the present Treaty, and in order more fully to secure the freedom of the navigation of the Danube, His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias consents to the rectification of his frontier in Bessarabia.

The new frontier shall begin from the Black Sea, one kilometre to the east of the Lake Bournasola, shall run perpendicularly to the Akerman road, shall follow that road to the *Val de Trajan*, pass to the south of Bolgrad, ascend the course of the River Yalpuck to the Height of Saratsika, and terminate at Katamori on the Pruth. Above that point the old frontier between the two empires shall not undergo any modification.

Delegates of the Contracting Powers shall fix, in its details, the line of the new frontier.

Art. XXI. The territory ceded by Russia shall be annexed to the Principality of Moldavia under the suzerainty of the Sublime Porte.

The inhabitants of that territory shall enjoy the rights and privileges secured to the Principalities; and, during the space of three years, they shall be permitted to transfer their domicile elsewhere, disposing freely of their property.

Art. XXII. The Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia shall continue to enjoy, under the suzerainty of the Porte, and under the guarantee of the Contracting Powers, the privileges and immunities of which they are in possession. No exclusive protection shall be exercised over them by any of the guaranteeing Powers. There shall be no separate right of interference in their internal affairs.

Art. XXIII. The Sublime Porte engages to preserve to the said Principalities an independent and national administration, as well as full liberty of worship, of legislation, of commerce, and of navigation.

The laws and statutes at present in force shall be revised. In order to establish a complete agreement in regard to such revision, a

Special Commission, as to the composition of which the High Contracting Powers will come to an understanding among themselves, shall assemble, without delay, at Bucharest, together with a Commissioner of the Sublime Porte.

The business of this commission shall be to investigate the present state of the Principalities, and to propose bases for their future organization.

Art. XXIV. His Majesty the Sultan promises to convoke immediately in each of the two provinces a Divan *ad hoc*, composed in such a manner as to represent most closely the interests of all classes of society. These Divans shall be called upon to express the wishes of the people in regard to the definitive organization of the Principalities.

An instruction from the Congress shall regulate the relations between the Commission and these Divans.

Art. XXV. Taking into consideration the opinion expressed by the two Divans, the Commission shall transmit, without delay, to the present seat of the Conferences, the result of its own labours.

The final agreement with the Suzerain Power shall be recorded in a Convention to be concluded at Paris between the High Contracting Parties, and a hatti-sherif, in conformity with the stipulations of the Convention, shall constitute definitively the organization of those Provinces, placed thenceforward under the collective guarantee of all the signing Powers.

Art. XXVI. It is agreed that there shall be in the Principalities a national armed force, organized with a view to maintain the security of the interior, and to ensure

that of the frontiers. No impediment shall be opposed to the extraordinary measures of defence which, by agreement with the Sublime Porte, they may be called upon to take in order to repel any external aggression.

Art. XXVII. If the internal tranquillity of the Principalities should be menaced or compromised, the Sublime Porte shall come to an understanding with the other Contracting Powers in regard to the measures to be taken for maintaining or re-establishing legal order. No armed intervention can take place without previous agreement between those Powers.

Art. XXVIII. The Principality of Servia shall continue to hold of the Sublime Porte, in conformity with the Imperial Hats which fix and determine its rights and immunities, placed henceforward under the collective guarantee of the Contracting Powers.

In consequence, the said Principality shall preserve its independent and national administration, as well as full liberty of worship, of legislation, of commerce, and of navigation.

Art. XXIX. The right of garrison of the Sublime Porte, as stipulated by anterior regulations, is maintained. No armed intervention can take place in Servia without previous agreement between the High Contracting Powers.

Art. XXX. His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias and His Majesty the Sultan maintain, in its integrity, the state of their possessions in Asia, such as it legally existed before the rupture.

In order to prevent all local dispute the line of frontier shall be verified, and, if necessary, rectified, without any prejudice as regards territory being sustained by either party.

For this purpose a mixed commission, composed of two Russian Commissioners, two Ottoman Commissioners, one English Commissioner, and one French Commissioner, shall be sent to the spot immediately after the re-establishment of diplomatic relations between the Court of Russia and the Sublime Porte. Its labours shall be completed within the period of eight months after the exchange of the ratifications of the present Treaty.

Art. XXXI. The territories occupied during the war by the troops of Their Majesties the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Emperor of Austria, the Emperor of the French, and the King of Sardinia, according to the terms of the Conventions signed at Constantinople on the 12th of March, 1854, between Great Britain, France, and the Sublime Porte; on the 14th of June, of the same year, between Austria and the Sublime Porte; and on the 15th of March, 1855, between Sardinia and the Sublime Porte; shall be evacuated as soon as possible after the exchange of the ratifications of the present Treaty. The periods and the means of execution shall form the object of an arrangement between the Sublime Porte and the Powers whose troops have occupied its territory.

Art. XXXII. Until the Treaties or Conventions which existed before the war between the belligerent Powers have been either renewed or replaced by new acts, commerce of importation or of exportation shall take place reciprocally on the footing of the regulations in force before the war; and in all other matters their subjects shall be respectively treated upon the footing of the most favoured nation.

Art. XXXIII. The Convention concluded this day between their Majesties the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Emperor of the French, on the one part, and His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, on the other part, respecting the Aland Islands, is and remains annexed to the present Treaty, and shall have the same force and validity as if it formed a part thereof.

Art. XXXIV. The present Treaty shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Paris in the space of four weeks, or sooner, if possible.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the same, and have affixed thereto the seal of their arms.

Done at Paris, the thirtieth day of the month of March, in the year one thousand eight hundred and fifty-six.

(L.S.) CLARENDON.
 (L.S.) COWLEY.
 (L.S.) BUOL-SCHAUENSTEIN.
 (L.S.) HUBNER.
 (L.S.) A. WALEWSKI.
 (L.S.) BOURQUENEY.
 (L.S.) MANTEUFFEL.
 (L.S.) C. M. D'HATZFELDT.
 (L.S.) ORLOFF.
 (L.S.) BRUNNOW.
 (L.S.) C. CAVOUR.
 (L.S.) DE VILLAMARINA.
 (L.S.) AALI.
 (L.S.) MEHEMMED DJEMIL.

ADDITIONAL AND TRANSITORY ARTICLE.

The stipulations of the Convention respecting the Straits, signed this day, shall not be applicable to the vessels of war employed by the belligerent Powers for the evacuation, by sea, of the territories occupied by their armies; but the

said stipulations shall resume their entire effect as soon as the evacuation shall be terminated.

Done at Paris, the thirtieth day of the month of March, in the year one thousand eight hundred and fifty-six.

(L.S.) CLARENDON.
 (L.S.) COWLEY.
 (L.S.) BUOL-SCHAUENSTEIN.
 (L.S.) HUBNER.
 (L.S.) A. WALEWSKI.
 (L.S.) BOURQUENEY.
 (L.S.) MANTEUFFEL.
 (L.S.) C. M. D'HATZFELDT.
 (L.S.) ORLOFF.
 (L.S.) BRUNNOW.
 (L.S.) C. CAVOUR.
 (L.S.) DE VILLAMARINA.
 (L.S.) AALI.
 (L.S.) MEHEMMED DJEMIL.

Conventions annexed to the preceding Treaty.

1.—CONVENTION BETWEEN HER MAJESTY, THE EMPEROR OF AUSTRIA, THE EMPEROR OF THE FRENCH, THE KING OF PRUSSIA, THE EMPEROR OF RUSSIA, AND THE KING OF SARDINIA, ON THE ONE PART, AND THE SULTAN, ON THE OTHER PART, RESPECTING THE STRAITS OF THE DARDANELLES AND OF THE BOSPHORUS.

Signed at Paris, March 30, 1856.

Ratifications exchanged at Paris, April 27, 1856.

In the Name of Almighty God.

Their Majesties the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Emperor of Austria, the Emperor of the French, the King of Prussia, the Emperor of all the Russias, signing parties to the Convention of the 13th day of July, 1841; and His Majesty the King of Sardinia, wishing to record in common their unanimous determination to conform to the

ancient rule of the Ottoman Empire, according to which the Straits of the Dardanelles and of the Bosphorus are closed to foreign ships of war, so long as the Porte is at peace.

Their said Majesties, on the one part, and His Majesty the Sultan on the other, have resolved to renew the Convention concluded at London on the 13th day of July, 1841, with the exception of some modifications of detail which do not affect the principle upon which it rests.

In consequence Their said Majesties have named for that purpose as their Plenipotentiaries, that is to say:

Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Right Honourable George William Frederick, Earl of Clarendon, &c., and the Right Honourable Henry Richard Charles Baron Cowley, &c.

His Majesty the Emperor of Austria, the Sieur Charles Ferdinand Count of Buol-Schauenstein, &c., and the Sieur Joseph Alexander Baron de Hübner, &c.

His Majesty the Emperor of the French, the Sieur Alexander Count Colonna Walewski, &c., and the Sieur Francis Adolphus Baron de Bourqueney, &c.

His Majesty the King of Prussia, the Sieur Otho Theodore Baron de Mauteuffel, &c., and the Sieur Maximilian Frederick Charles Francis Count of Hatzfeldt Wildenburg-Schoenstein, &c.

His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, the Sieur Alexis Count Orloff, &c., and the Sieur Philip Baron de Brunnow, &c.

His Majesty the King of Sardinia, the Sieur Camille Benso, Count of Cavour, &c., and the Sieur Salvator Marquis de Villamarina, &c.

And His Majesty the Emperor

of the Ottomans, Mouhammed Emin Aali Pasha, &c., and Mehemmed Djemil Bey, &c.

Who, after having exchanged their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:—

Art. I. His Majesty the Sultan, on the one part, declares that he is firmly resolved to maintain for the future the principle invariably established as the ancient rule of his empire, and in virtue of which it has at all times been prohibited for the ships of war of foreign Powers to enter the Straits of the Dardanelles and of the Bosphorus; and that, so long as the Porte is at peace, His Majesty will admit no foreign ship of war into the said Straits.

And Their Majesties the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Emperor of Austria, the Emperor of the French, the King of Prussia, the Emperor of all the Russias, and the King of Sardinia, on the other part, engage to respect this determination of the Sultan, and to conform themselves to the principle above declared.

Art. II. The Sultan reserves to himself, as in past times, to deliver firmans of passage for light vessels under flag of war, which shall be employed, as is usual, in the service of the Missions of Foreign Powers.

Art. III. The same exception applies to the light vessels under flag of war, which each of the Contracting Powers is authorised to station at the mouths of the Danube in order to secure the execution of the regulations relative to the liberty of that river, and the number of which is not to exceed two for each Power.

Art. IV. The present Convention, annexed to the General

Treaty signed at Paris this day, shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged in the space of four weeks, or sooner if possible.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the same, and have affixed thereto the seal of their arms.

Done at Paris, the thirtieth day of the month of March, in the year one thousand eight hundred and fifty-six.

(L.S.) CLARENDON.
 (L.S.) COWLEY.
 (L.S.) BUOL-SCHAUENSTEIN.
 (L.S.) HUBNER.
 (L.S.) A. WALEWSKI.
 (L.S.) BOURQUENEY.
 (L.S.) MANTEUFFEL.
 (L.S.) C. M. D'HATZFELDT.
 (L.S.) ORLOFF.
 (L.S.) BRUNNOW.
 (L.S.) C. CAVOUR.
 (L.S.) DE VILLAMARINA.
 (L.S.) AALI.
 (L.S.) MEHEMMED DJEMIL.

2.—CONVENTION BETWEEN THE
 EMPEROR OF RUSSIA AND THE
 SULTAN, LIMITING THEIR NAVAL
 FORCE IN THE BLACK SEA.

Signed at Paris, March 30, 1856.

*Ratifications exchanged at Paris,
 April 27, 1856.*

In the Name of Almighty God.

His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, and His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, taking into consideration the principle of the neutralization of the Black Sea, established by the preliminaries contained in the Protocol No. 1, signed at Paris on the 25th of February of the present year, and wishing in consequence, to regulate by common agreement the number and the force of the light vessels which they have reserved to themselves to maintain in the

Black Sea for the service of their coasts, have resolved to sign, with that view, a special Convention, and have named for that purpose :

His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, the Sieur Alexis Count Orloff, &c., and the Sieur Philip Baron de Brunnow, &c.

And His Majesty the Emperor of the Ottomans, Mouhammed Emin Aali Pasha, &c., and Mehemmed Djemil Bey, &c.

Who, after having exchanged their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:—

Art. I. The High Contracting Parties mutually engage not to have in the Black Sea any other vessels of war than those of which the number, the force, and the dimensions are hereinafter stipulated.

Art. II. The High Contracting Parties reserve to themselves each to maintain in that sea six steam-vessels of fifty metres in length at the line of floatation, of a tonnage of eight hundred tons at the maximum, and four light steam or sailing vessels of a tonnage which shall not exceed two hundred tons each.

Art. III. The present Convention, annexed to the General Treaty signed at Paris this day, shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged in the space of four weeks, or sooner if possible.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the same and have affixed thereto the seal of their arms.

Done at Paris, the thirtieth day of the month of March, in the year one thousand eight hundred and fifty-six.

(L.S.) ORLOFF.
 (L.S.) BRUNNOW.
 (L.S.) AALI.
 (L.S.) MEHEMMED DJEMIL.

3. — CONVENTION BETWEEN HER MAJESTY, THE EMPEROR OF THE FRENCH, AND THE EMPEROR OF RUSSIA, RESPECTING THE ALAND ISLANDS.

Signed at Paris, March 30, 1856.

Ratifications exchanged at Paris, April 27, 1856.

(Translation.)

In the Name of Almighty God.

Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, His Majesty the Emperor of the French, and his Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, wishing to extend to the Baltic Sea the harmony so happily re-established between them in the East, and thereby to consolidate the benefits of the general peace, have resolved to conclude a Convention, and have named for that purpose ;

Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Right Honourable George William Frederick Earl of Clarendon, &c., and the Right Honourable Henry Richard Charles Baron Cowley, &c. ;

His Majesty the Emperor of the French, the Sieur Alexander Count Colonna Walewski, &c., and the Sieur Francis Adolphus Baron de Bourqueney, &c. ;

And His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, the Sieur Alexis Count Orloff, &c., and the Sieur Philip Baron de Brunnow, &c. ;

Who, after having exchanged their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles :—

Art. I. His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, in order to respond to the desire which has been expressed to him by Their

VOL. XCVIII.

Majesties the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and the Emperor of the French, declares that the Aland Islands shall not be fortified, and that no military or naval establishment shall be maintained or created there.

Art. II. The present Convention, annexed to the General Treaty signed at Paris this day, shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged in the space of four weeks, or sooner if possible.

In witness whereof, the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the same, and have affixed thereto the seal of their arms.

Done at Paris, the thirtieth day of the month of March, in the year one thousand eight hundred and fifty-six.

(L.S.) CLARENDON.

(L.S.) COWLEY.

(L.S.) A. WALEWSKI.

(L.S.) BOURQUENEY.

(L.S.) ORLOFF.

(L.S.) BRUNNOW.

II. — DECLARATION RESPECTING MARITIME LAW, SIGNED BY THE PLENIPOTENTIARIES OF GREAT BRITAIN, AUSTRIA, FRANCE, PRUSSIA, RUSSIA, SARDINIA, AND TURKEY, ASSEMBLED IN CONGRESS AT PARIS, *April 16, 1856.*

(Translation.)

The Plenipotentiaries who signed the Treaty of Paris of the thirtieth of March, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-six, assembled in Conference,—

Considering :

That maritime law, in time of war, has long been the subject of deplorable disputes ;

That the uncertainty of the law and of the duties in such a matter

Y

gives rise to differences of opinion between neutrals and belligerents which may occasion serious difficulties, and even conflicts ;

That it is, consequently, advantageous to establish a uniform doctrine on so important a point ;

That the Plenipotentiaries assembled in Congress at Paris cannot better respond to the intentions by which their Governments are animated than by seeking to introduce into international relations fixed principles in this respect ;

The above-mentioned Plenipotentiaries, being duly authorised, resolved to concert among themselves as to the means of attaining this object ; and, having come to an agreement, have adopted the following solemn Declaration :—

1. Privateering is, and remains, abolished ;

2. The neutral flag covers enemy's goods, with the exception of contraband of war ;

3. Neutral goods, with the exception of contraband of war, are not liable to capture under enemy's flag ;

4. Blockades, in order to be binding, must be effective, that is to say, maintained by a force sufficient really to prevent access to the coast of the enemy.

The Governments of the undersigned Plenipotentiaries engage to bring the present Declaration to the knowledge of the States which have not taken part in the Congress of Paris, and to invite them to accede to it.

Convinced that the maxims which they now proclaim cannot but be received with gratitude by the whole world, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries doubt not that the efforts of their Governments to obtain the general adoption there-

of will be crowned with full success.

The present Declaration is not, and shall not, be binding, except between those Powers who have acceded, or shall accede, to it.

Done at Paris, the sixteenth of April, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-six.

(Signed) BUOL-SCHAUENSTEIN.
HUBNER.
WALEWSKI.
BOURQUENEY.
CLARENDON.
COWLEY.
MANTEUFFEL.
HATZFELDT.
ORLOFF.
BRUNNOW.
CAVOUR.
DE VILLAMARINA.
AALI.
MEHEMMED DJEMIL.

III. — TREATY BETWEEN HER MAJESTY, THE EMPEROR OF AUSTRIA, AND THE EMPEROR OF THE FRENCH, GUARANTEEING THE INDEPENDENCE AND INTEGRITY OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE.

Signed at Paris, April 15, 1856.

Ratifications exchanged at Paris, April 29, 1856.

(Translation.)

Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, His Majesty the Emperor of Austria, and His Majesty the Emperor of the French, wishing to settle between themselves the combined action which any infraction of the stipulations of the Peace of Paris would involve on their part, have named for that purpose as their Plenipotentiaries, that is to say :

Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Right Honourable George William Frederick Earl of Clarendon, &c., and the Right Honourable Henry Richard Charles Baron Cowley, &c. ;

His Majesty the Emperor of Austria, the Sieur Charles Ferdinand Count de Buol-Schauenstein, &c., and the Sieur Joseph Alexander Baron de Hübner, &c. ;

And His Majesty the Emperor of the French, the Sieur Alexander Count Colonna Walewski, &c., and the Sieur Francis Adolphus Baron de Bourqueney, &c. ;

Who, after having exchanged their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles :—

Art. I. The High Contracting Parties guarantee, jointly and severally, the independence and the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, recorded in the Treaty concluded at Paris on the thirtieth of March, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-six.

Art. II. Any infraction of the stipulations of the said Treaty will be considered by the Powers signing the present Treaty as *casus belli*. They will come to an understanding with the Sublime Porte as to the measures which have become necessary, and will without delay determine among themselves as to the employment of their military and naval forces.

Art. III. The present Treaty shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged in a fortnight, or sooner if possible.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the same, and have affixed thereto the seal of their arms.

Done at Paris, the fifteenth day of the month of April, in the year

one thousand eight hundred and fifty-six.

(L.S.) CLARENDON.

(L.S.) COWLEY.

(L.S.) BUOL-SCHAUENSTEIN.

(L.S.) HUBNER.

(L.S.) A. WALEWSKI.

(L.S.) BOURQUENEY.

IV.—TREATY BETWEEN HER MAJESTY, THE EMPEROR OF THE FRENCH, AND THE KING OF SWEDEN AND NORWAY.

Signed at Stockholm, November 21, 1855.

Ratifications exchanged at Stockholm, December 17, 1855.

(Translation.)

Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, His Majesty the Emperor of the French, and His Majesty the King of Sweden and Norway, being anxious to avert any complication which might disturb the existing balance of power in Europe, have resolved to come to an understanding with a view to secure the integrity of the United Kingdoms of Sweden and Norway, and have named as their Plenipotentiaries to conclude a Treaty for that purpose, that is to say :

Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Arthur Charles Magenis, Esquire, Her Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to His Majesty the King of Sweden and Norway ;

His Majesty the Emperor of the French, the Sieur Charles Victor Lobstein, Officer of the Imperial Order of the Legion of Honour, Grand Cross of the Royal Order of the Polar Star of Sweden, Commander of the Order of Christ, and Knight of that of

the Conception of Portugal, his Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to His Majesty the King of Sweden and Norway;

And His Majesty the King of Sweden and Norway, the Sieur Gustavus Nicholas Algernon Adolphus Baron de Stierneld, his Minister of State and for Foreign Affairs, Knight and Commander of his Orders, Grand Cross of the Order of St. Olaf, of Norway, &c., &c., &c.;

Who, after having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:—

Art. I. His Majesty the King of Sweden and Norway engages not to cede to nor to exchange with Russia, nor to permit her to occupy, any part of the territories belonging to the Crowns of Sweden and Norway. His Majesty the King of Sweden and Norway engages, further, not to cede to Russia any right of pasturage, of fishery, or of any other nature whatsoever, either on the said territories or upon the coasts of Sweden and Norway, and to resist any pretension which may be put forward by Russia with a view to establish the existence of any of the rights aforesaid.

Art. II. In case Russia should make to His Majesty the King of Sweden and Norway any proposal or demand having for its object to obtain either the cession or the exchange of any part whatsoever of the territories belonging to the Crowns of Sweden and Norway, or the power of occupying certain points of the said territories, or the cession of rights of fishery, of pasturage, or of any other right upon the said territories and upon the coasts of Sweden and Norway, His Majesty the King of Sweden

and Norway engages forthwith to communicate such proposal or demand to Her Britannic Majesty and His Majesty the Emperor of the French; and Their said Majesties, on their part, engage to furnish to His Majesty the King of Sweden and Norway sufficient naval and military forces to co-operate with the naval and military forces of His said Majesty, for the purpose of resisting the pretensions or aggressions of Russia. The description, number, and destination of such forces shall, if occasion should arise, be determined by common agreement between the three Powers.

Art. III. The present Treaty shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Stockholm as soon as possible.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the same, and have affixed thereto the seal of their arms.

Done at Stockholm, the twenty-first of November, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty-five.

(L.S.) ARTHUR C. MAGENIS.

(L.S.) VOR. LOBSTEIN.

(L.S.) STIERNELD.

V.—TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, COMMERCE, AND RECIPROCAL ESTABLISHMENT, BETWEEN HER MAJESTY AND THE SWISS CONFEDERATION.

Signed at Berne, September 6, 1855.

Ratifications exchanged at Berne, March 6, 1856.

(Translation.)

Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and the Swiss Confederation, being animated with the desire to maintain and strengthen the ties of friendship which

happily subsist between the two countries, and to promote by every means in their power the commercial relations between their respective subjects and citizens, have resolved to conclude a Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and reciprocal Establishment, and have for that purpose named as their Plenipotentiaries, that is to say:—

Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, George John Robert Gordon, Esquire, Her Minister Plenipotentiary to the Swiss Confederation;

And the Federal Council of the Swiss Confederation, Jonas Furrer, Doctor of Laws, President of the Swiss Confederation; and Frederick Frey Herosée, Federal Colonel, Member of the Swiss Federal Council;

Who, after having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon and concluded the following Articles:—

Art. I. The subjects of Her Britannic Majesty shall be admitted to reside in each of the Swiss Cantons on the same conditions, and on the same footing, as citizens of the other Swiss Cantons. In the same manner, Swiss citizens shall be admitted to reside in all the territories of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland on the same conditions, and on the same footing, as British subjects.

Consequently, the subjects and citizens of either of the two Contracting Parties shall, provided they conform to the laws of the country, be at liberty, with their families, to enter, establish themselves, reside, and remain in any part of the territories of the other. They may hire and occupy houses and warehouses for the purposes

of residence and commerce, and may exercise, conformably to the laws of the country, any profession or business, or carry on trade in articles of lawful commerce by wholesale or retail, and may conduct such trade either in person or by any brokers or agents whom they may think fit to employ, provided such brokers or agents shall themselves also fulfil the conditions necessary for being admitted to reside in the country. They shall not be subject to any taxes, charges, or conditions, in respect of residence, establishment, passports, licences to reside, establish themselves, or to trade, or in respect of permission to exercise their profession, business, trade, or occupation, greater or more onerous than those which are or may be imposed upon the subjects or citizens of the country in which they reside; and they shall, in all these respects, enjoy every right, privilege, and exemption which is or may be accorded to subjects or citizens of the country, or to subjects or citizens of the most favoured nation.

Art. II. The subjects or citizens of either of the two Contracting Parties residing or established in the territories of the other, who may wish to return to their country, or who may be sent back thither by a judicial sentence, by a measure of police legally adopted and executed, or in conformity with the laws respecting mendicity or morals, shall, with their families, be received at all times and under all circumstances, in the country of which they are natives, and where they shall have retained their rights conformably to the laws.

Art. III. The dwellings and warehouses of the subjects or citizens of either of the two Contracting Parties in the territories of

the other, and all premises appertaining thereto, destined for purposes of residence or commerce, shall be respected. No search of, or visit to, such dwellings and premises, and no examination or inspection of the books, papers, or accounts of the respective subjects and citizens, shall be arbitrarily made, but such measures shall be executed only in conformity with the legal sentence, warrant, or order in writing of some tribunal or magistrate having competent constitutional or legal jurisdiction.

The subjects and citizens of either of the two Contracting Parties in the territories of the other, shall moreover have free and open access to the courts of justice for the prosecution and defence of their rights. They shall enjoy in this respect the same rights and privileges as subjects or citizens of the country, and shall, like them, be at liberty to employ, in all causes, their advocates, attornies, or agents from among the persons admitted to the exercise of those professions according to the laws of the country.

Art. IV. The subjects and citizens of either of the two Contracting Parties in the territories of the other shall be at full liberty to acquire, possess, and dispose of, whether by purchase, sale, donation, exchange, marriage, testament, succession *ab intestato*, or in any other manner whatever, every description of property which the laws of the country may permit any foreigners, of whatsoever nation, to hold. Their heirs and representatives may succeed to, and take possession of, such property, either in person or by agents acting on their behalf, in the ordinary form of law, in the same manner as subjects or citizens of the coun-

try; and in the absence of such heirs and representatives the property shall be treated in the same manner as the like property belonging to a subject or citizen of the country under similar circumstances.

In none of these respects shall they pay upon the value of such property any other or higher impost, duty, or charge, than is payable by subjects or citizens of the country. In every case the subjects and citizens of the Contracting Parties shall be permitted to export their property; that is to say, British subjects from the Swiss territory, and Swiss citizens from the British territory, freely, and without being subjected on such exportation to pay any duty as foreigners, and without having to pay any other or higher duties than those to which subjects or citizens of the country are liable.

Art. V. The subjects or citizens of either of the two Contracting Parties in the territories of the other, shall be exempted from all compulsory military service whatever, whether in the army, navy, or national guard or militia. They shall also be exempted from all contributions, whether pecuniary or in kind, imposed as a compensation for personal service, as well as from military requisitions, with the exception of lodging and supplies, according to the custom of the country, and demandable alike from citizens and foreigners, for the military on a march.

Art. VI. No other or higher duty, tax, impost, or charge, either in time of peace or in time of war, shall, under any circumstances, be imposed or levied upon, or in respect of, any property held by a subject or citizen of one of the two Contracting Parties in the territories of the other, than is or

may be imposed or levied upon, or in respect of, the like property belonging to a subject or citizen of the country, or to a subject or citizen of the most favoured nation.

Nor shall any other tax or demand whatever be imposed or levied upon a subject or citizen of either of the Contracting Parties in the territories of the other Contracting Party, other or higher than is or may be imposed or levied upon a subject or citizen of the country, or upon a subject or citizen of the most favoured nation.

Art. VII. It shall be free for each of the two Contracting Parties to appoint Consuls to reside in the territories of the other Party; but before any Consul shall act as such, he shall, in the usual form, be approved and admitted by the Government to which he is sent; and either of the Contracting Parties may except from the residence of Consuls such particular places as either of them may judge fit to be excepted.

The Consuls of each of the Contracting Parties in the dominions of the other shall enjoy whatever privileges, exemptions, and immunities are, or shall be, granted there to Consuls of the most favoured nation.

Art. VIII. In all that relates to the importation into, the warehousing in, the transit through, and the exportation from, their respective territories, of any article of lawful commerce, the two Contracting Parties engage that their respective subjects and citizens shall be placed upon the same footing as subjects and citizens of the country, or as the subjects and citizens of the most favoured nation in any case where the latter may enjoy an exceptional advantage not granted to natives.

Art. IX. Neither of the two Contracting Parties shall impose upon the importation, warehousing, transit, or exportation of any article, the growth, produce, or manufacture of the territories of the other, any other or higher duty than that which is or may be imposed upon the like article, being the growth, produce, or manufacture of any other foreign country.

Art. X. The two Contracting Parties further engage that any favour in matters of commerce which either of them may hereafter grant to any third Power, shall be also, and at the same time, extended to the other Contracting Party.

Art. XI. The present Treaty shall continue in force for ten years from the date of the exchange of the ratifications thereof, and further until the end of twelve months after either of the two Contracting Parties shall have given notice to the other of its intention to terminate the same; each of the Contracting Parties being at liberty to give such notice to the other at the end of the said term of ten years, or at any time afterwards.

Art. XII. The present Treaty shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Berne as soon as possible within twelve months after its signature.

In witness whereof, the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the same in the English and French languages, and have affixed thereto the seal of their arms.

Done in duplicate at Berne, the sixth day of September, in the year of grace one thousand eight hundred and fifty-five.

(L.S.) G. J. R. GORDON.

(L.S.) DR. FURRER.

(L.S.) F. FREY HEROSÉE.

VI.—TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, COMMERCE, AND NAVIGATION, BETWEEN HER MAJESTY AND THE REPUBLIC OF CHILE.

Signed at Santiago, Oct. 4, 1854.

Ratifications exchanged at Santiago, November 29, 1855.

(Translation.)

Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and the Republic of Chile, being desirous to maintain and improve the relations of good understanding which happily subsist between them, and to promote the commercial intercourse between their respective subjects and citizens, have deemed it expedient to conclude a Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation, and have for that purpose named as their respective Plenipotentiaries, that is to say:—

Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Honourable Edward Alfred John Harris, a Captain in Her Royal Navy, Her Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires to the Republic of Chile;

And His Excellency the President of the Republic of Chile, Don Carlos Bello;

Who, after having communicated to each other their full powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon and concluded the following Articles:

Art. I. There shall be perpetual friendship between Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Her heirs and successors, and the Republic of Chile, and between their respective subjects and citizens.

Art. II. There shall be between all the dominions of Her Britannic Majesty, and the territories of

the Republic of Chile, a reciprocal freedom of commerce. The subjects and citizens of each of the two countries respectively shall have liberty freely and securely to come, with their ships and cargoes, to all places, ports, and rivers in the territories of the other, where trade with other nations is permitted. They may remain and reside in any part of the said territories respectively, and hire and occupy houses and warehouses, and may trade, by wholesale or retail, in all kinds of produce, manufactures, and merchandize of lawful commerce; and shall enjoy the same protection and security in their persons and property, and in the exercise of their industry and commerce, as may be enjoyed by native subjects and citizens according to the laws of the respective countries.

In like manner, the ships of war and Post-office packets of each Contracting Party, respectively, shall have liberty to enter into all harbours, rivers, and places within the territories of the other, to which the ships of war and packets of other nations are or may be permitted to come; to anchor there, and to remain and refit; subject always to the laws and regulations of the two countries, respectively.

Art. III. No other or higher duties shall be imposed on the importation into the dominions of Her Britannic Majesty, of any article the growth, produce, or manufacture of the Republic of Chile; and no other or higher duties shall be imposed on the importation into the territories of the Republic of Chile, of any article the growth, produce, or manufacture of Her Britannic Majesty's dominions, than are or shall be payable on the like article the

growth, produce, or manufacture of any other foreign country. Nor shall any other or higher duties or charges be imposed in the dominions or territories of either of the Contracting Parties, on the exportation of any article to the dominions or territories of the other, than such as are or may be payable on the exportation of the like article to any other foreign country. No prohibition shall be imposed upon the importation of any article the growth, produce, or manufacture of the territories of either of the two Contracting Parties into the territories of the other, which shall not equally extend to the importation of the like articles being the growth, produce, or manufacture of any other country; nor shall any prohibition be imposed on the exportation of any article from the territories of either of the two Contracting Parties to the territories of the other, which shall not equally extend to the exportation of the like article to the territories of all other nations.

Art. IV. No duties of tonnage, harbour, pilotage, lighthouse, quarantine, or other similar or corresponding duties, of whatever nature or under whatever denomination, levied in the name of or for the profit of the Government, public functionaries, corporations, or establishments of whatever kind, shall be imposed in the ports of either country upon the vessels of the other country, from whatever port or place arriving, which shall not be equally imposed in the like cases on national vessels; and in neither country shall any duty, charge, restriction, or prohibition be imposed upon goods imported into or exported from one country in vessels of the other, which shall

not equally be imposed upon such goods when so imported or exported in national vessels. In like manner, the same drawbacks, bounties, exemptions, or concessions which may be granted upon goods imported or exported in national vessels, shall be understood to be granted on the importation or exportation in the vessels of each of the two countries, respectively.

Art. V. The same duties shall be paid on the importation of any article which is or may be legally importable into the territories of the Republic of Chile, whether such importation shall be in Chilian or in British vessels; and the same duties shall be paid on the importation of any article which is or may be legally importable into the dominions of Her Britannic Majesty, whether such importation shall be in British or in Chilian vessels. The same duties shall be paid, and the same bounties and drawbacks allowed, on the exportation of any article which is or may be legally exportable from the Republic of Chile, whether such exportation shall be in Chilian or in British vessels; and the same duties shall be paid, and the same bounties and drawbacks allowed, on the exportation of any article which is or may be legally exportable from Her Britannic Majesty's dominions whether such exportation shall be in British or in Chilian vessels.

Art. VI. All vessels which, according to the laws of Great Britain, are to be deemed British vessels, and all vessels which, according to the laws of the Republic of Chile, are to be deemed Chilian vessels, shall, for the purposes of this Treaty, be deemed British vessels and Chilian vessels respectively.

Art. VII. All merchants, commanders of ships and others, the

subjects and citizens of either of the High Contracting Parties, shall have full liberty, in all the territories of the other, to manage their own affairs themselves, or to commit them to the management of whomsoever they please, as broker, agent, factor, or interpreter; and they shall not be obliged to employ any other persons than those employed by native subjects or citizens, nor to pay to such persons as they shall think fit to employ, any higher salary or remuneration than such as is paid in like cases by native subjects or citizens. They shall be at liberty to buy from and to sell to whom they like, and absolute freedom shall be allowed in all cases to the buyer and seller, to bargain and to fix the price of any goods, wares, or merchandize of licit traffic, imported into or exported from the territories of either of the High Contracting Parties respectively, as they shall see good, observing the laws and established customs of the country.

Art. VIII. The subjects and citizens of either of the High Contracting Parties, in the territories of the other, shall receive and enjoy the same full and perfect protection for their persons and property which is dispensed to native subjects and citizens, and shall have free and open access to the courts of justice in the said countries, respectively, for the prosecution and defence of their just rights; and they shall be at liberty to employ, in all cases, the advocates, attorneys, or lawful agents of whatever description, whom they may think proper, and they shall enjoy in this respect the same rights and privileges as native subjects and citizens.

Art. IX. In whatever relates to

the police of the ports, the lading and unlading of ships, the warehousing and safety of merchandize, goods, and effects, the succession to personal estates by will or otherwise, and the disposal of personal property of every sort and denomination, by sale, donation, exchange, or testament, or in any other manner whatsoever, as also with regard to the administration of justice, the subjects and citizens of each Contracting Party shall enjoy, in the dominions and territories of the other, the same privileges, liberties, and rights as native subjects and citizens; and shall not be charged, in any of these respects, with any other or higher imposts or duties than those which are or may be paid by native subjects or citizens; subject always to the local laws and regulations of such dominions or territories.

Art. X. If any subject or citizen of either of the High Contracting Parties should die in the dominions or territories of the other without will or testament, and if no person should present himself, who, according to the laws of the country in which the death may have taken place, is lawfully entitled to succeed to him, the Consul-General, Consul, or Vice-Consul of the nation to which the deceased may belong, shall, so far as the laws of the country may permit, be the lawful representative of such of his countrymen as may have an interest in the succession; and the Consul shall, as such representative, exercise, in as far as the laws of each country may permit, all the rights which the person so lawfully entitled to succeed to the deceased could exercise, with the exception of the right to receive money or effects,

to do which a special order shall always be necessary; the said money or effects being in the meantime deposited in the hands of a person to the satisfaction of the local authorities and the Consul. If the succession should be real estate, in this case the rights of the persons interested shall be regulated by what the laws of each country ordains respecting foreigners.

Art. XI. The subjects of Her Britannic Majesty residing in the Republic of Chile, and the citizens of the Republic of Chile residing in the dominions of Her Britannic Majesty, shall be exempted from all compulsory military service whatsoever, whether by sea or land, and from all forced loans, or military exactions or requisitions; and they shall not be compelled, under any pretext whatsoever, to pay any ordinary charges, requisitions, or taxes, other or higher than those that are or may be paid by native subjects or citizens.

It is understood that the differential duty denominated "de Patente," and which is charged in Chile to foreign merchants and shopkeepers, is not abolished by the stipulations in the first part of this Article. The subjects of Her Britannic Majesty shall in this respect be placed upon the footing of the most favoured foreign nation.

The subjects of Her Britannic Majesty who, according to the present existing laws of the Republic of Chile, and whilst they exist, may acquire and hold real estate of every kind, shall enjoy with respect to the said property the same rights as the citizens of the Republic of Chile in like cases, and shall be subject to the same charges and imposts as the Chilean citizens, holders of real estate.

Art. XII. It shall be free for each of the two Contracting Parties to appoint Consuls for the protection of trade, to reside in the dominions and territories of the other party; but before any Consul shall act as such, he shall, in the usual form, be approved and admitted by the Government to which he is sent; and either of the Contracting Parties may except from the residence of Consuls such particular places as either of them may judge fit to be excepted. The Diplomatic Agents and Consuls of each of the two High Contracting Parties in the dominions or territories of the other, shall enjoy whatever privileges, exemptions, and immunities, are or shall be granted there to Agents of the same rank belonging to the most favoured nation.

Art. XIII. It is agreed and covenanted between the High Contracting Parties, that they will afford every aid consistent with the laws of their respective countries for the apprehension and surrender of deserters from the naval and military or from the merchant service of either country, on application being made to that effect by the Consul of the party concerned, and on it being proved by the register of the vessel, the list of the crew, or other similar documents, that the said deserters formed part of the crew of the said vessel, and that they had deserted from vessels in the ports, coasts, or waters of the country before whose authorities they are claimed.

With respect to the detention of deserters in the public prisons, and the time they ought to remain under the control of the local authorities, when apprehended, in order that they may be placed at

the disposal of the Consul who claims them, and be sent on board vessels of their nation, the rules established by the laws of each country respectively shall be observed; and during such time as there shall be no special laws enacted on this subject in the Republic of Chile, the local authorities shall grant in this respect the same co-operation which in like cases is afforded by the British authorities according to the laws of Great Britain.

And it is further agreed, that any other favour or facility with respect to the recovery of deserters which either of the Contracting Parties has granted, or may hereafter grant, to any other State, shall also be granted to the other Contracting Party in the same manner as if such favour or facility had been expressly stipulated by the present Treaty.

Art. XIV. For the better security of commerce between the subjects and citizens of the two High Contracting Parties, it is agreed that if at any time any rupture, or any interruption of friendly intercourse, should unfortunately take place between the two Contracting Parties, the subjects or citizens of either of them, established in the territories of the other, who may reside upon the coasts, shall be allowed six months, and those who may reside in the interior, a whole year, to wind up their accounts and to dispose of their property; and a safe-conduct shall be given to them to embark at the port which they themselves shall select. The subjects or citizens of the two Contracting Parties who may be established in the dominions or territories of the other, in the exercise of any trade or other oc-

cupation or employment, shall be allowed to remain and continue in the exercise of the said trade or occupation, notwithstanding the interruption of friendship between the two countries, in the free enjoyment of their personal liberty and property, so long as they behave peaceably and observe the laws; and their goods and effects, of whatever description they may be, whether in their own custody, or entrusted to individuals or to the State, shall not be liable to seizure or sequestration, or to any other charges or demands they those which may be made upon the like effects or property belonging to native subjects or citizens. In the same case, debts between individuals, public funds, and the shares of companies, shall never be confiscated, sequestered, or detained.

Art. XV. The subjects or citizens of either of the two Contracting Parties residing in the territories of the other, shall not be molested, persecuted, or annoyed on account of their religion, but shall have perfect and entire liberty of conscience therein; nor shall they on this account fail to enjoy, in their persons and property, the same protection which is extended to native subjects and citizens.

If in the city, town, or district, where the subjects or citizens of either of the Contracting Parties may reside, there shall not have been established cemeteries for the burial of those of their religious belief, they may, with the consent of the superior local authority, and in the place selected with the approbation of that authority, establish a cemetery. This cemetery, and the burials which may take place in it, shall be subject to the police regulations which the civil au-

thorities of either country may dictate.

Art. XVI. If any ship of war or merchant-vessel of either of the High Contracting Parties should be wrecked on the coasts of the other, such ship or vessel, or any part thereof, and all furniture and appurtenances belonging thereunto, and all goods and merchandize which may be saved therefrom, or the produce thereof, if sold, shall be faithfully restored to the proprietors, upon being claimed by them or by their duly authorised agents; and if there are no such proprietors or agents on the spot, then the said goods and merchandize, or the proceeds thereof, shall, as well as all the papers found on board such wrecked vessel or ship, be delivered to the British or Chilian Consul in whose district the wreck may have taken place: and such Consul, proprietors, or agents, shall pay only the expenses incurred in the preservation of the property, together with the rate of salvage which would have been payable in the like case of a wreck of a national vessel. The goods and merchandize saved from the wreck shall not be subject to duties unless cleared for consumption.

Art. XVII. When in case of war, and in order to protect the interests of the State seriously compromised, the welfare of the country may render indispensable an embargo or general closing of the ports by either of the two Contracting Parties, it is stipulated that if the embargo or closing of the ports does not exceed six days, the merchant-vessels which may have been included in this measure shall not claim any indemnity on account of lay days or prejudice to their

interests; but if the detention should be more than six days, and does not exceed twelve, the Government which may have laid on the embargo or closing of the ports, shall be obliged to refund to the masters of the vessels detained, as an indemnity, the amount of expenses arising from the wages and support of their crews for the time they may have been forced to remain, counting from the seventh day. If circumstances of a very exceptional gravity should render it necessary to prolong the embargo beyond the term of twelve days, the Government, author of the measure, shall be obliged to indemnify the vessels detained for their losses and prejudices suffered from the forced detention in consequence of the embargo or closing of the ports.

It is likewise stipulated that in the event of the property of a subject or citizen of either of the High Contracting Parties resident in the territories of the other being taken, used, or injured, by the legitimate authorities of that country for public purposes, full indemnity or compensation shall be paid to him by the Government of the country in which the measure is taken. And in case the amount of these indemnities cannot be arranged in an amicable manner, the determination regarding them shall be submitted to arbiters named, the one by the Government author of the embargo or measure which gives rise to the claim, and the other by the Diplomatic Agent, and in his absence by the Consul-General, of the nation to which the vessel detained, or proprietor injured, may belong. In case these arbiters cannot agree, the

final determination, without appeal, shall be referred to the Government of a third friendly Power.

Art. XVIII. It is stipulated that the present Treaty shall last from the date of the exchange of the ratifications for the term of ten years; but it shall continue obligatory even after this term has expired, if neither of the Contracting Parties shall have announced to the other, with twelve months' notice, its wish that the said Treaty should cease. The same term shall intervene between the notice and the expiration of the Treaty, at whatever period such notice may be given, the ten years during which the Treaty ought to last having expired.

Notice having been given by either of the Contracting Parties of its resolution that the Treaty should cease, and after the term of twelve months having elapsed, all the stipulations contained in the said Treaty shall cease and expire, excepting those relating to peace and friendship between the two countries and their subjects and citizens, which shall continue obligatory for both parties.

Art. XIX. The present Treaty shall be ratified, and the ratifications exchanged at Santiago, in two years, or sooner if possible.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the same, and have affixed thereto their respective seals.

Done at Santiago, this fourth day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four.

(L.S.) E. A. J. HARRIS.

(L.S.) CARLOS BELLO.

VII.—CONVENTION BETWEEN HER MAJESTY AND THE EMPEROR OF JAPAN.

*Signed at Nagasaki, in the English and Japanese languages,
October 14, 1854.*

Ratifications exchanged at Nagasaki, October 9, 1855.

CONVENTION FOR REGULATING THE ADMISSION OF BRITISH SHIPS INTO THE PORTS OF JAPAN.

It is agreed between Sir James Stirling, Knight, Rear-Admiral, and Commander-in-Chief of the ships and vessels of Her Britannic Majesty in the East Indies and seas adjacent, and Mezi-no Chekfuno Kami, Obunyo of Nagasaki, and Nagai Evan Ocho, Omedski of Nagasaki, ordered by His Imperial Highness the Emperor of Japan, to act therein, that—

1st. The ports of Nagasaki (Fisen) and Hakodadi (Matsmai) shall be open to British ships for the purposes of effecting repairs, and obtaining fresh water, provisions, and other supplies of any sort they may absolutely want for the use of the ships.

2nd. Nagasaki shall be open for the purposes aforesaid from and after the present date, and Hakodadi from and after the end of fifty days from the Admiral's departure from this port. The rules and regulations of each of these ports are to be complied with.

3rd. Only ships in distress from weather, or unmanageable, will be permitted to enter other ports than those specified in the foregoing Articles, without permission from the Imperial Government.

4th. British ships in Japanese ports shall conform to the laws of Japan. If high officers or com-

manders of ships shall break any such laws, it will lead to the ports being closed. Should inferior persons break them, they are to be delivered over to the commanders of their ships for punishment.

5th. In the ports of Japan, either now open, or which may hereafter be opened, to the ships or subjects of any foreign nation, British ships and subjects shall be entitled to admission, and to the enjoyment of an equality of advantages with those of the most favoured nation, always excepting the advantages accruing to the Dutch and Chinese from their existing relations with Japan.

6th. This Convention shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Nagasaki on behalf of Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain, and on behalf of His Highness the Emperor of Japan, within twelve months from the present date.

7th. When this Convention shall be ratified, no high officer coming to Japan, shall alter it.

In witness whereof we have signed the same, and have affixed our seals thereunto, at Nagasaki, this fourteenth day of October, 1854.

(L.S.) JAMES STIRLING.

N.B.—The Japanese text was signed by the Japanese Plenipotentiaries.

Exposition of the Articles of the Convention of Nagasaki of the 14th of October, 1854, agreed to on the 18th of October, 1855, by their Excellencies the Rear-Admiral Commanding-in-Chief and the Japanese Commissioners.

(*Exposition.*)

The first Article of the Convention opens the ports of Nagasaki

and Hakodadi to British ships for repairs and supplies. It opens the whole and every part of those ports; but ships must be guided in anchoring by the directions of the local Government. Safe and convenient places will be assigned where ships may be repaired. Workmen, materials, and supplies will be provided by the local Government according to a tariff to be agreed upon, by which also the modes of payment will be regulated. All official communications will hereafter, when Japanese shall have time to learn English, be made in that language. A British burial-ground shall be set apart on Medsume Sima, fenced in by a stone wall, and properly protected.

The second Article provides that at each of the ports of Nagasaki and Hakodadi the Port Regulations shall be obeyed; but the Japanese Government will take care that they shall not be of a nature to create embarrassment, nor to contradict in any other way the general tenour and intent of the Treaty, the main object of which is to promote a friendly intercourse between Great Britain and Japan.

The third Article declares that only ships in distress from weather, or unmanageable, shall enter other ports than Nagasaki and Hakodadi without permission from the Imperial Government; but ships of war have a general right to enter the ports of friendly Powers in the unavoidable performance of public duties, which right can neither be waived nor restricted; but Her Majesty's ships will not enter any other than open ports without necessity, or without offering proper explanations to the imperial authorities.

The fourth Article provides that British ships and subjects in Japanese ports shall conform to the laws of Japan; and that if any subordinate British subjects commit offences against the laws, they shall be handed over to their own officers for punishment; and that if high officers or commanders of ships shall break the laws, it will lead to the closing of the ports specified. All this is as it should be; but it is not intended by this Article that any acts of individuals, whether high or low, previously unauthorised or subsequently disapproved of by Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain, can set aside the Convention entered into with Her Majesty alone by His Imperial Highness the Emperor of Japan.

The fifth Article secures in the fullest sense to British ships and subjects in every port of Japan, either now open or hereafter to be opened, an equality in point of advantage and accommodation with the ships and subjects or citizens of any other foreign nation, excepting any peculiar privilege hitherto conceded to the Dutch and Chinese in the port of Nagasaki. If therefore any other nation or people be now or hereafter permitted to enter other ports than Nagasaki and Hakodadi, or to appoint Consuls, or to open trade, or to enjoy any advantage or privilege whatever, British ships and subjects shall, as of right, enter upon the enjoyment of the same.

Arrangement regarding Stamps.

An arrangement made subsequently to the Convention requires that British ships intending to visit Japan, shall be provided with a document in proof of their na-

tionality, and as a check upon the conduct of vessels in Japanese ports; and Her Majesty's Government has directed a form of certificate of registration to be adopted,* which has been accepted as satisfactory by the Japanese authorities; and merchant ships arriving in Japanese ports are to submit their certificate of registration to the officers to be appointed by the Japanese authorities, and to permit them to make such extracts from it as may seem good to them, before such ships can be admitted to obtain repairs and supplies. Her Majesty's ships of war will not be provided with such documents; but the officers in command, upon proper application, will afford all reasonable information regarding their ships.

REGULATIONS FOR THE PORT OF
NAGASAKI, COMMUNICATED TO
REAR-ADMIRAL JAMES STIRLING
BY THE GOVERNOR OF NAGASAKI,
OCTOBER, 1854.

Standing Port Regulations.

Art. I. Ships shall anchor within Two-sima, and there await the directions of the Governor.

Art. II. No firearms to be discharged.

Art. III. No person to land on any of the islands.

Art. IV. No soundings to be taken, nor boats to be pulling about.

Art. V. Should any communication be desired, a boat of the upper officers shall be called; but no communication shall be held with merchant-boats, and no exchange of articles take place, or trading of any sort.

* The form of Register issued to British vessels at the Custom-house.

The above being according to the law of Great Japan, all commanders and other officers shall obey the same, and orders shall be given to the crew that the aforesaid law shall not be broken.

No Regulations for the Port of Hakodadi have yet been communicated.

II. FOREIGN.

1.—FIRMAN AND HATTI-SHERIF BY THE SULTAN, RELATIVE TO THE PRIVILEGES AND REFORMS IN TURKEY.

Lord Stratford de Redcliffe to the Earl of Clarendon.—(Received March 5.)

(Translation).

Let it be done as herein set forth.

To you, my Grand Vizier, Mehemed Emin Aali Pasha, decorated with my Imperial Order of the Medjidiyé of the first class, and with the Order of Personal Merit; may God grant to you greatness, and increase your power!

It has always been my most earnest desire to insure the happiness of all classes of the subjects whom Divine Providence has placed under my Imperial sceptre, and since my accession to the Throne I have not ceased to direct all my efforts to the attainment of that end.

Thanks to the Almighty, these unceasing efforts have already been productive of numerous useful results. From day to day the happiness of the nation and the wealth of my dominions go on augmenting.

It being now my desire to renew and enlarge still more the new institutions ordained with the view of establishing a state of things

conformable with the dignity of my Empire and the position which it occupies among civilized nations, and the rights of my Empire having, by the fidelity and praiseworthy efforts of all my subjects, and by the kind and friendly assistance of the great Powers, my noble allies, received from abroad a confirmation which will be the commencement of a new era, it is my desire to augment its well-being and prosperity, to effect the happiness of all my subjects, who in my sight are all equal, and equally dear to me, and who are united to each other by the cordial ties of patriotism, and to insure the means of daily increasing the prosperity of my Empire.

I have therefore resolved upon, and I order the execution of the following measures.

The guarantees promised on our part by the Hatt-i-Humaïoun of Gul-Hané, and in conformity with the Tanzimat, to all the subjects of my Empire, without distinction of classes or of religion, for the security of their persons and property and the preservation of their honour, are to-day confirmed and consolidated, and efficacious measures shall be taken in order that they may have their full and entire effect.

All the privileges and spiritual immunities granted by my ancestors, *ab antiquo*, and at subsequent dates, to all Christian communities or other non-Mussulman persuasions established in my Empire under my protection, shall be confirmed and maintained.

Every Christian or other non-Mussulman community shall be bound, within a fixed period, and with the concurrence of a Commission composed *ad hoc* of members of its own body, to proceed

with my high approbation and under the inspection of my Sublime Porte, to examine into its actual immunities and privileges, and to discuss and submit to my Sublime Porte the reforms required by the progress of civilization and of the age. The powers conceded to the Christian Patriarchs and Bishops by the Sultan Mahomet II. and his successors shall be made to harmonize with the new position which my generous and beneficent intentions insure to these communities.

The principle of nominating the Patriarchs for life, after the revision of the rules of election now in force, shall be exactly carried out, conformably to the tenour of their firmans of investiture.

The Patriarchs, Metropolitans, Archbishops, Bishops, and Rabbins shall take an oath on their entrance into office according to a form agreed upon in common by my Sublime Porte and the spiritual heads of the different religious communities. The ecclesiastical dues, of whatever sort or nature they be, shall be abolished and replaced by fixed revenues for the Patriarchs and heads of communities, and by the allocation of allowances and salaries equitably proportioned to the importance of the rank and the dignity of the different members of the clergy.

The property, real or personal, of the different Christian ecclesiastics shall remain intact; the temporal administration of the Christian or other non-Mussulman communities, shall, however, be placed under the safeguard of an Assembly to be chosen from among the members, both ecclesiastics and laymen, of the said communities.

In the towns, small boroughs,

and villages, where the whole population is of the same religion, no obstacle shall be offered to the repair, according to their original plan, of buildings set apart for religious worship, for schools, for hospitals, and for cemeteries.

The plans of these different buildings, in case of their new erection must, after having been approved by the Patriarchs or heads of communities, be submitted to my Sublime Porte, which will approve of them by my Imperial order, or make known its observations upon them within a certain time.

Each sect, in localities where there are no other religious denominations, shall be free from every species of restraint as regards the public exercise of its religion.

In the towns, small boroughs, and villages where different sects are mingled together, each community, inhabiting a distinct quarter, shall, by conforming to the above-mentioned ordinances, have equal power to repair and improve its churches, its hospitals, its schools, and its cemeteries. When there is question of the erection of new buildings, the necessary authority must be asked for through the medium of the Patriarchs and heads of communities from my Sublime Porte, which will pronounce a sovereign decision according to that authority, except in the case of administrative obstacles. The intervention of the administrative authority in all measures of this nature will be entirely gratuitous. My Sublime Porte will take energetic measures to insure to each sect, whatever be the number of its adherents, entire freedom in the exercise of its religion.

Every distinction or designation

tending to make any class whatever of the subjects of my Empire inferior to another class, on account of their religion, language, or race, shall be for ever effaced from the Administrative Protocol. The laws shall be put in force against the use of any injurious or offensive terms, either among private individuals or on the part of the authorities.

As all forms of religion are and shall be freely professed in my dominions, no subject of my Empire shall be hindered in the exercise of the religion that he professes, nor shall be in any way annoyed on this account. No one shall be compelled to change their religion.

The nomination and choice of all functionaries and other *employés* of my Empire being wholly dependent upon my sovereign will, all the subjects of my Empire, without distinction of nationality, shall be admissible to public employments, and qualified to fill them according to their capacity and merit, and conformably with rules to be generally applied.

All the subjects of my Empire, without distinction, shall be received into the Civil and Military Schools of the Government, if they otherwise satisfy the conditions as to age and examination which are specified in the Organic Regulations of the said Schools. Moreover, every community is authorised to establish Public Schools of Science, Art, and Industry. Only the method of instruction and the choice of professors in schools in this class shall be under the control of a Mixed Council of Public Instruction, the members of which shall be named by my sovereign command.

All commercial, correctional,

and criminal suits between Mussulmans and Christian or other non-Mussulman subjects, or between Christians or other non-Mussulmans of different sects, shall be referred to Mixed Tribunals.

The proceedings of these tribunals shall be public; the parties shall be confronted, and shall produce their witnesses, whose testimony shall be received, without distinction, upon an oath taken according to the religious law of each sect.

Suits relating to civil affairs shall continue to be publicly tried, according to the laws and regulations, before the Mixed Provincial Councils, in the presence of the Governor and Judge of the place. Special civil proceedings, such as those relating to successions or others of that kind, between subjects of the same Christian or other non-Mussulman faith, may, at the request of the parties, be sent before the Councils of the Patriarchs or of the communities.

Penal, correctional, and commercial laws, and rules of procedure for the Mixed Tribunals, shall be drawn up as soon as possible, and formed into a code. Translations of them shall be published in all the languages current in the Empire.

Proceedings shall be taken, with as little delay as possible, for the reform of the penitentiary system as applied to houses of detention, punishment or correction, and other establishments of like nature, so as to reconcile the rights of humanity with those of justice. Corporal punishment shall not be administered, even in the prisons, except in conformity with the disciplinary regulations established by my Sublime Porte, and every-

thing that resembles torture shall be entirely abolished.

Infractions in the law in this particular shall be severely repressed, and shall besides entail, as of right, the punishment, in conformity with the Civil Code, of the authorities who may order and of the agents who may commit them.

The organization of the police in the capital, in the provincial towns, and in the rural districts, shall be revised in such a manner as to give to all the peaceable subjects of my Empire the strongest guarantees for the safety both of their persons and property.

The equality of taxes entailing equality of burdens, as equality of duties entails that of rights, Christian subjects, and those of other non-Mussulman sects, as it has been already decided, shall, as well as Mussulmans, be subject to the obligations of the Law of Recruitment. The principle of obtaining substitutes, or of purchasing exemption, shall be admitted. A complete law shall be published, with as little delay as possible, respecting the admission into and service in the army of Christian and other non-Mussulman subjects.

Proceedings shall be taken for a reform in the constitution of the Provincial and Communal Councils, in order to ensure fairness in the choice of the Deputies of the Mussulman, Christian, and other communities, and freedom of voting in the Councils. My Sublime Porte will take into consideration the adoption of the most effectual means for ascertaining exactly and for controlling the result of the deliberations and of the decisions arrived at.

As the laws regulating the purchase, sale, and disposal of real

property are common to all the subjects of my Empire, it shall be lawful for foreigners to possess landed property in my dominions, conforming themselves to the laws and police regulations, and bearing the same charges as the native inhabitants, and after arrangements have been come to with foreign Powers.

The taxes are to be levied under the same denomination from all the subjects of my Empire, without distinction of class or of religion. The most prompt and energetic means for remedying the abuses in collecting the taxes, and especially the tithes, shall be considered. The system of direct collection shall gradually, and as soon as possible, be substituted for the plan of farming, in all the branches of the revenues of the State. As long as the present system remains in force, all agents of the Government and all members of the Medjlis shall be forbidden, under the severest penalties, to become lessees of any farming contracts which are announced for public competition, or to have any beneficial interest in carrying them out. The local taxes shall, as far as possible, be so imposed as not to affect the sources of production, or to hinder the progress of internal commerce.

Works of public utility shall receive a suitable endowment, part of which shall be raised from private and special taxes levied in the Provinces, which shall have the benefit of the advantages arising from the establishment of ways of communication by land and sea.

A special law having been already passed, which declares that the Budget of the revenue and expenditure of the State shall be drawn up and made known

every year, the said law shall be most scrupulously observed. Proceedings shall be taken for revising the emoluments attached to each office.

The heads of each community and a delegate, designated by my Sublime Porte, shall be summoned to take part in the deliberations of the Supreme Council of Justice on all occasions which might interest the generality of the subjects of my Empire. They shall be summoned specially for this purpose by my Grand Vizier. The delegates shall hold office for one year; they shall be sworn on entering upon their duties. All the members of the Council, at the ordinary and extraordinary meetings, shall freely give their opinions and their votes, and no one shall ever annoy them on this account.

The laws against corruption, extortion, or malversation shall apply, according to the legal forms, to all the subjects of my Empire, whatever may be their class and the nature of their duties.

Steps shall be taken for the formation of banks and other similar institutions, so as to effect a reform in the monetary and financial system, as well as to create funds to be employed in augmenting the sources of the material wealth of my Empire.

Steps shall also be taken for the formation of roads and canals to increase the facilities of communication and increase the sources of the wealth of the country. Everything that can impede commerce or agriculture shall be abolished. To accomplish these objects means shall be sought to profit by the science, the arts, and the funds of Europe, and thus gradually to execute them.

Such being my wishes and my

commands, you, who are my Grand Vizier, will, according to custom, cause this Imperial firman to be published in my capital, and in all parts of my Empire; and you will watch attentively and take all the necessary measures that all the orders which it contains be henceforth carried out with the most rigorous punctuality.

2.—COPY OF THE PROTOCOL OF WARSAW RELATIVE TO THE DANISH SUCCESSION, AND OF THE RENEWAL OF THAT DOCUMENT BY RUSSIA IN 1852.

(Translation.)

His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, and his Majesty the King of Denmark, taking into consideration the engagements entered between their august predecessors, in the years 1767 and 1773;

Considering that, as well for establishing the tranquillity of the North of Europe on a durable footing, as for removing all that could then, or for the future, give rise to misunderstandings or differences in the august House of Oldenburg, the Emperor Paul, of glorious memory, then Grand Duke of Russia, renounced for himself, as also for his heirs and descendants, in favour of his Majesty King Christian VII., of glorious memory, as also of the heirs of his royal crown, all his rights and pretensions to the Duchy of Schleswig in general, and to the heretofore princely portion of that duchy in particular.

That in the same manner, and from the same motives, his Majesty the Emperor Paul ceded for himself, as also for his descendants, heirs, and successors, all that he possessed in the Duchy of Holstein, whether in common with his

Majesty the King of Denmark, or separately.

Considering that this act of cession of the Duchy of Holstein has only been made expressly in favour of his Majesty King Christian VII., and of his male lineage, and also eventually in favour of the late Prince Frederick, the king's brother, and of the male lineage of that prince, and that the eventualities which the terms themselves of this Act of Session admitted, have already in part been realized by the extinction of the male lineage of King Christian VII., or may be realised at a period more or less near, without the said transactions having in any manner provided for them.

Foreseeing the dangers which this silence in existing treaties may cause to the Danish monarchy, if, on the extinction of the male line actually on the throne of Denmark, the *lex regia* should receive its pure and simple application to one part of the monarchy ;—

Have acknowledged the obligation and the right, as successors of the august contracting parties, to the engagements of 1767 and 1773, to come to an understanding as to the ulterior arrangements most suited to the double objects which they have had in view.

In consequence, the Undersigned, after mature examination of all the questions connected with this affair, have agreed amongst themselves, under the express reservation of the high approbation of their respective Sovereigns, and have embodied in the protocol the points which follow :

1°. The objects proposed in the interest of the peace of the North, as well as that of the internal peace of the august House of Oldenburgh,

namely, the maintenance of the integrity of the Danish monarchy, can only be realized by means of an arrangement summoning to the succession of the whole of the states actually united under the sceptre of His Majesty the King of Denmark, the male lineage solely, to the exclusion of women.

2°. The male lineage of Prince Christian of Sleswig-Holstein Sonderbourg Glücksbourg and of his consort the Princess Louise of Hesse, unites in itself the rights of inheritance, which, on the extinction of the male line actually reigning in Denmark, devolve upon it in virtue of the renunciations of Her Royal Highness the Landgravine Charlotte of Hesse, of her son Prince Frederick of Hesse, and of her daughter the Princess Mary of Anhalt-Dessau.

3°. Wishing on his part to complete the titles resulting from these renunciations, and thus to effect an arrangement which would be of such high importance and interest for the maintenance of the Danish monarchy in its integrity, His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, as chief of the elder branch of Holstein Gottorp, would be ready to renounce the eventual rights which belong to him in favour of Prince Christian of Glücksbourg, and of his male lineage.

Nevertheless it is understood :

That the eventual rights of the two younger branches of Holstein Gottorp should be expressly reserved.

That those which the august chief of the elder branch should abandon for himself and for his male lineage in favour of Prince Christian of Glücksbourg and of his male lineage, should be revived in the Imperial House of Russia whenever (which God forbid) the

male lineage of that prince should become extinct.

That inasmuch as the renunciation of His Majesty the Emperor would principally have for its object to facilitate an arrangement called for by the first interests of the monarchy, the offer of such a renunciation would cease to be obligatory if the arrangement itself should fail.

4°. In consequence of the considerations which are above pointed out by the above §§ 2 & 3, the Prince Christian of Glücksbourg, conjointly with the Princess, his consort, and in their default, the male lineage of their Highnesses, would have, more than any other branch, claims which qualify them to succeed, if the contingency should arrive, to the States actually united under the sceptre of his Danish Majesty.

Consequently the two Courts of Copenhagen and of St. Petersburg have agreed,—

That his Majesty the King of Denmark shall designate the Prince and Princess of Glücksbourg conjointly as heirs presumptive of his Crown, in case the male line of the dynasty actually reigning should become extinct.

That his Majesty shall make known his high determination to the Powers in amity with Denmark.

That if, to ensure the complete success of this arrangement, still further renunciations should be deemed useful and desirable, it would be for his Danish Majesty to make himself responsible for the indemnities to which just and equitable claims should be established;

Finally, that the negotiations necessary to give to the arrangements in virtue whereof the Prince

and Princess of Glücksbourg shall be acknowledged as successors presumptive to the throne of Denmark, the character of an European transaction, shall take place in London.

The undersigned reserve to themselves to submit the present Protocol to their august Sovereigns, and to solicit their high approbation in favour of the provision it contains.

(Signed)

NESSELRODE.

MEYENDORFF.

REEDTZ.

Warsaw, this ^{24 May}_{5 June} 1851.

Translation of a Note addressed by Baron Brunnow to the Minister for Denmark.

London, ^{25 April}_{8 May} 1852.

The Undersigned Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of his Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias to Her Britannic Majesty, having been authorised to sign the Treaty, concluded this day conjointly with his Excellency the Chamberlain de Bille, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of His Majesty the King of Denmark, has been ordered to transmit to him at the same time the present Note, for the purpose of recalling and renewing the reserves contained in the Protocol of Warsaw, of ^{24 May}_{5 June} 1851; which, after having received the sanction of His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, and of His Majesty the King of Denmark, was conveyed to the knowledge of the Cabinets who have signed the present Treaty.

The third paragraph of the Protocol above mentioned is worded in these terms:—

“Wishing on his part to complete the titles resulting from these renunciations, and thus to effect an arrangement which would be of such high importance for the maintenance of the Danish monarchy in its integrity, His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, as chief of the elder branch of Holstein Gottorp, would be ready to renounce the eventual rights which belong to him in favour of Prince Christian of Glücksbourg, and of his male lineage.

“Nevertheless it is understood that the eventual rights of the two younger branches of Holstein Gottorp should be expressly reserved.

“That those which the august chief of the elder branch should abandon for himself, and for his

male lineage, in favour of Prince Christian of Glücksbourg, and of his male lineage, should be revived in the Imperial House of Russia whenever (which God forbid) the male lineage of that Prince should become extinct.

“That inasmuch as the renunciation of His Majesty the Emperor would principally have for its object to facilitate an arrangement called for by the chief interests of the monarchy, the offer of such a renunciation would cease to be obligatory, if the arrangement itself should fail.”

In renewing, by order of his Government, the reserves above mentioned,

The Undersigned, &c. &c.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

ORDER OF VICTORIA.

A “COPY OF THE ROYAL WARRANT DATED THE 29TH DAY OF JANUARY 1856, LAYING DOWN THE REGULATIONS UNDER WHICH THE DECORATION OF THE VICTORIA CROSS IS TO BE CONFERRED.”

War Office, February 1857.

F. PEEL.

VICTORIA R.

Whereas We, taking into Our Royal consideration that there exists no means of adequately rewarding the individual gallant services either of officers of the lower grades in Our naval and military service, or of warrant and petty officers, seamen, and Marines, in Our navy, and non-commissioned officers and soldiers in our Army ;

and whereas the third class of Our most Honourable order of the Bath is limited, except in very rare cases, to the higher ranks of both services, and the granting of medals, both in Our navy and army, is only awarded for long service or meritorious conduct, rather than for bravery in action or distinction before an enemy, such cases alone excepted where a general medal is

granted for a particular action or campaign, or a clasp added to the medal for some especial engagement, in both of which cases all share equally in the boon, and those who by their valour have particularly signalized themselves remain undistinguished from their comrades: Now, for the purpose of attaining an end so desirable as that of rewarding individual instances of merit and valour, We have instituted and created, and by these presents, for Us, Our heirs and successors, institute and create a new naval and military decoration, which We are desirous should be highly prized and eagerly sought after by the officers and men of our naval and military services, and are graciously pleased to make, ordain, and establish the following rules and ordinances for the government of the same, which shall from henceforth be inviolably observed and kept:

First. It is ordained, that the distinction shall be styled and designated "the Victoria Cross," and shall consist of a Maltese Cross of bronze, with Our Royal Crest in the centre, and underneath with an escroll, bearing this inscription, "For Valour."

Secondly. It is ordained, that the Cross shall be suspended from the left breast, by a blue riband for the navy, and by a red riband for the army.

Thirdly. It is ordained, that the names of those upon whom We may be pleased to confer the decoration shall be published in the *London Gazette*, and a registry thereof kept in the office of Our Secretary of State for War.

Fourthly. It is ordained, that any one who, after having received the Cross, shall again perform an act of bravery, which, if he had not

received such cross, would have entitled him to it, such further act shall be recorded by a Bar attached to the riband by which the Cross is suspended, and for every additional act of bravery an additional Bar may be added.

Fifthly. It is ordained, that the Cross shall only be awarded to those officers or men who have served Us in the presence of the enemy, and shall have then performed some signal act of valour or devotion to their country.

Sixthly. It is ordained, with a view to place all persons on a perfectly equal footing in relation to eligibility for the decoration, that neither rank, nor long service, nor wounds, nor any other circumstance or condition whatsoever, save the merit of conspicuous bravery, shall be held to establish a sufficient claim to the honour.

Seventhly. It is ordained that the decoration may be conferred on the spot where the act to be rewarded by the grant of such decoration has been performed, under the following circumstances:—

I. When the fleet or army, in which such act has been performed, is under the eye and command of an admiral or general officer commanding the forces.

II. Where the naval or military force is under the eye and command of an admiral or commodore commanding a squadron or detached naval force, or of a general commanding a corps, or division, or brigade on a distinct and detached service, when such admiral, commodore, or general officer shall have the power of conferring the decoration on the spot, subject to confirmation by Us.

Eighthly. It is ordained, where

such act shall not have been performed in sight of a commanding officer as aforesaid, then the claimant for the honour shall prove the act to the satisfaction of the captain or officer commanding his ship, or to the officer commanding the regiment to which the claimant belongs, and such captain or such commanding officer shall report the same through the usual channel to the admiral or commodore commanding the force employed on the service, or to the officer commanding the forces in the field, who shall call for such description and attestation of the act as he may think requisite, and on approval shall recommend the grant of the decoration.

Ninthly. It is ordained, that every person selected for the Cross, under Rule Seven, shall be publicly decorated before the naval or military force or body to which he belongs, and with which the act of bravery for which he is to be rewarded, shall have been performed, and his name shall be recorded in a General Order, together with the cause of his especial distinction.

Tenthly. It is ordained, that every person selected under Rule Eight shall receive his decoration, as soon as possible, and his name shall likewise appear in a General Order as above required, such General Order to be issued by the naval or military commander of the forces employed on the service.

Eleventhly. It is ordained, that the General Orders above referred to shall from time to time be transmitted to Our Secretary of State for War, to be laid before Us, and shall be by him registered.

Twelfthly. It is ordained, that as cases may arise not falling within the rules above specified, or in which a claim, though well found-

ed, may not have been established on the spot, We will, on the joint submission of Our Secretary of State for War and of Our Commander-in-chief of Our army, or on that of Our Lord High Admiral or Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty in the case of the navy, confer the decoration, but never without conclusive proof of the performance of the act of bravery for which the claim is made.

Thirteenthly. It is ordained, that in the event of a gallant and daring act having been performed by a squadron ship's company, a detached body of seamen and marines, not under fifty in number, or by a brigade, regiment, troop, or company, in which the admiral, general, or other officer commanding such forces may deem that all are equally brave and distinguished, and that no special selection can be made by them: then in such case, the admiral, general, or other officer commanding, may direct, that for any such body of seamen or marines, or for every troop or company of soldiers, one officer shall be selected by the officers engaged for the decoration; and in like manner one petty officer or non-commissioned officer shall be selected by the petty officers and non-commissioned officers engaged; and two seamen or private soldiers or marines shall be selected by the seamen, or private soldiers, or marines engaged respectively for the decoration; and the names of those selected shall be transmitted by the senior officer in command of the naval force, brigade, regiment, troop, or company, to the admiral or general officer commanding, who shall in due manner confer the decoration, as if the acts were done under his own eye.

Fourteenthly. It is ordained,

that every warrant officer, petty officer, seaman, or marine, or non-commissioned officer or soldier, who shall have received the Cross, shall, from the date of the act by which the decoration has been gained, be entitled to a special pension of Ten Pounds a-year, and each additional Bar conferred under Rule Four on such warrant or petty officers or non-commissioned officers or men, shall carry with it an additional pension of Five Pounds per annum.

Fifteenthly. In order to make such additional provision as shall effectually preserve pure this most honourable distinction, it is ordained, that if any person on whom such distinction shall be conferred, be convicted of treason, cowardice, felony, or of any infamous crime, or if he be accused of any such offence, and doth not after a reasonable time surrender himself to be tried for the same, his name

shall forthwith be erased from the registry of individuals upon whom the said decoration shall have been conferred by an especial warrant under Our Royal Sign Manual, and the pension conferred under Rule Fourteen shall cease and determine from the date of such warrant. It is hereby further declared that We, Our heirs and successors, shall be the sole judges of the circumstance demanding such expulsion; moreover, We shall at all times have power to restore such persons as may at any time have been expelled, both to the enjoyment of the decoration and pension.

Given at Our Court at Buckingham Palace, this twenty-ninth of January, in the nineteenth year of Our reign, and in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty-six.

By Her Majesty's Command,
PANMURE.

CASUALTIES IN THE CRIMEA.

RETURN of the Total Number of OFFICERS and MEN in the ARMY who have been KILLED in the CRIMEA up to the 1st June 1856, distinguishing Cavalry, Infantry, Artillery, Sappers and Miners, as well as Officers, Non-commissioned Officers, and Men.

	NUMBER KILLED.		
	Officers.	Non-commissioned Officers.	Men.
Cavalry - - - - -	8	10	104
Artillery - - - - -	10	10	111
Sappers and Miners - - - - -	9	1	31
Infantry - - - - -	119	140	2,191
Staff - - - - -	11	—	—
Total - - - - -	157	161	2,437
GENERAL TOTAL - - - 2,755			

CASUALTIES IN THE CRIMEA—*continued*.

RETURN of the Total Number of OFFICERS and MEN in the ARMY who have been Wounded in the *Crimea*; of the Wounded who have since Died; of those who have been Invalided; of those who have Recovered and Returned to their Duty; of those who have Died from Sickness; of those Invalided, distinguishing Cavalry, Infantry, Sappers, and Miners, as well as Officers, Non-commissioned Officers, and Men up to the 1st June, 1856.

	Number Wounded.			Number of Wounded since dead.			Number of Wounded since Invalided.	Number Recovered and Returned to duty.		Number Died from Sickness.			Number Invalided to the End of the War.	
	Officers.	Non-Commissioned Officers.	Men.	Officers.	Non-Commissioned Officers.	Men.		Non-Commissioned Officers.*	Men.*	Non-Commissioned Officers.*	Men.*	Non-Commissioned Officers.*	Men.*	Non-Commissioned Officers.*
Cavalry -	22	21	216	4	1	25	Non-Commissioned Officers and Men.	38	585	23	954	70	850	
Artillery -	30	37	595	1	4	48		98	1,171	10	1,263	164	1,953	
Sappers and Miners -	12	7	79	6	1	22	See Invalided.	18	154	5	168	41	176	
Infantry -	422	514	9,892	73	79	1,753		528	8,920	104	12,935	862	10,602	
Staff -	29	—	—	2	—	—		—	—	5	—	—	—	
TOTAL -	515	579	10,782	86	85	1,848	—	682	10,830	147	15,320	1,137	13,581	

* With respect to the Columns, the Return No. 204 states, "There are no documents in the Adjutant-General's Office, which will afford the information specified in the above Columns; and the same can only be obtained (and probably then but imperfectly) from Officers Commanding Regiments in the *Crimea*."

Parliamentary Papers 204, Sess. 1854—5.
 " 57, Sess. 1857.

A TABLE OF ALL THE STATUTES

*Passed in the FOURTH Session of the SIXTEENTH Parliament of the
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.*

19° & 20° VICT.

PUBLIC GENERAL ACTS.

- I. **A**N Act to regulate certain Offices of the House of Commons.
- II. An Act to amend the Acts relating to the Metropolitan Police.
- III. An Act to extend the period for which Her Majesty may grant Letters Patent of Incorporation to Joint Stock Banks in *Scotland* existing before the Act of one thousand eight hundred and forty-six.
- IV. An Act to apply the Sum of One million six hundred and thirty-one thousand and five Pounds One Shilling and Five-pence out of the Consolidated Fund to the Service of the Year ending the thirty-first day of *March* One thousand eight hundred and fifty-six.
- V. An Act for funding Exchequer Bills and raising Money by way of Annuities.
- VI. An Act for raising Five Millions by way of Annuities.
- VII. An Act to apply the sum of Twenty-six Millions out of the Consolidated Fund to the Service of the Year One thousand eight hundred and fifty-six.
- VIII. An Act for the Regulation of Her Majesty's Royal Marine Forces while on shore.
- IX. An Act to amend the Acts relating to the Advance of Public Money to promote the Improvement of Land.
- X. An Act for Punishing Mutiny and Desertion, and for the better Payment of the Army and their Quarters.
- XI. An Act to authorise the Inclosure of certain Lands in pursuance of a Report of the Inclosure Commissioners for *England* and *Wales*.
- XII. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made under an Act of the Fifteenth Year of Her present Majesty, to facilitate Arrangements for the Relief of Turnpike Trusts.
- XIII. An Act to make Provision for the Management of certain Lands belonging to Her Majesty within the former Limits of the late forest of *Delamere*, in the county of *Chester*.
- XIV. An Act to abolish the Office of Secretary to the Poor Law Commissioners in *Ireland*.
- XV. An Act for further regulating the Payment of the Out-Pensioners of *Greenwich* and *Chelsea* Hospitals.
- XVI. An Act to empower the Court of Queen's Bench to order certain Offenders to be tried at the Central Criminal Court.
- XVII. An Act to authorise for a further Period the Advance of Money out of the Consolidated Fund for carrying on Public Works and Fisheries, and for the Employment of the Poor.
- XVIII. An Act to authorise for a further Period the Application of Money for the Purposes of Loans for carrying on Public Works in *Ireland*.
- XIX. An Act for raising the Sum of Twenty-one Million one hundred and eighty-two thousand seven hundred Pounds by Exchequer Bills for the Service of the Year One thousand eight hundred and fifty-six.
- XX. An Act to continue certain Compositions payable to Bankers who have ceased to issue Bank Notes.
- XXI. An Act for raising the further Sum of Five Millions by way of Annuities.
- XXII. An Act to amend the Laws relating to the Duties on Fire Insurances.
- XXIII. An Act for granting certain additional Powers and Authorities to the *Canada* Company.
- XXIV. An Act for enabling the Commissioners of Public Works in *Ireland* to acquire certain Lands for the Site of a Prison for the Reception of Juvenile Convicts.

- XXV. An Act to amend the Law relating to Drafts on Bankers.
- XXVI. An Act to confirm Provisional Orders of the General Board of Health applying the Public Health Act, 1848, to the Districts of *Waterloo with Seaforth, West Ham, Sowerby Bridge, and Moss-side*; for Alteration of the Boundaries of the Districts of *Rusholme and Bishop Auckland*; and for other Purposes.
- XXVII. An Act to amend the Acts relating to Pawnbrokers.
- XXVIII. An Act to make further Provision for rendering Reformatory and Industrial Schools in *Scotland* more available for the Benefit of Vagrant Children.
- XXIX. An Act to extend the Powers of the Trustees and Director of the National Gallery, and to authorise the Sale of Works of Art belonging to the Public.
- XXX. An Act to settle an Annuity on Sir *William Fenwick Williams*, in consideration of his eminent Services.
- XXXI. An Act to amend the Act of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Years of Her Majesty, concerning the University of *Oxford* and the College of *Saint Mary Winchester*.
- XXXII. An Act to amend the *Whichwood Disafforesting Act, 1853*.
- XXXIII. An Act to continue the Act for extending for a limited Time the Provision for Abatement of Income Tax in respect of Insurance on Lives.
- XXXIV. An Act to grant Allowances of Excise Duty on Malt in Stock; to alter and regulate certain Drawbacks and Allowances in respect of Malt Duty; to repeal and re-impose the Excise Duty on Sugar used in brewing Beer; and to amend the Law relating to Malt Roasters.
- XXXV. An Act to authorise the *West India Relief Commissioners* to grant further Time for the Repayment of Monies advanced by them in certain Cases.
- XXXVI. An Act for the better Preservation of the Peace in *Ireland*.
- XXXVII. An Act to amend the Act for transferring to Counties in *Ireland* certain Works constructed wholly or in part with the Public Money.
- XXXVIII. An Act for the further Amendment of the Laws relating to Labour in Factories.
- XXXIX. An Act to carry into effect a Convention respecting a Loan by Her Majesty to the King of *Sardinia*.
- XL. An Act to amend an Act of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Years of Her present Majesty relating to Industrial and Provident Societies.
- XLI. An Act to make further Provision for the Establishment of Savings Banks for Seamen.
- XLII. An Act to continue the Act for the Exemption of Stock in Trade from Rating.
- XLIII. An Act to authorise Issues out of the Consolidated Fund for the Redemption of certain Annuities charged on Branches of the gross Revenue.
- XLIV. An Act for raising the Sum of Four Millions by Exchequer Bills and Exchequer Bonds, for the Service of the Year One thousand eight hundred and fifty-six.
- XLV. An Act for confirming a Scheme of the Charity Commissioners for *Saint Mary Magdalen Hospital* near *Bath*.
- XLVI. An Act to exempt Imprisonments under the Act of 5 Geo. IV. c. 96, from the Operation of the Act abolishing in *Scotland* Imprisonment for Civil Debts of small Amount.
- XLVII. An Act for the Incorporation and Regulation of Joint Stock Companies and other Associations.
- XLVIII. An Act for amending the Procedure before Magistrates and Justices of Peace in *Scotland*.
- XLIX. An Act to continue certain Turnpike Acts in *Great Britain*.
- L. An Act to enable Parishioners and others, forming a numerous Class, to sell Advowsons held by or in trust for them, and to apply the Proceeds in providing Parsonage Houses, augmenting small Livings, and to other beneficial Purposes; and for giving other Powers to such Persons.
- LI. An Act to permit the Use of Rice in the Distillation of Spirits.
- LII. An Act to suspend the making of Lists and the Ballots for the Militia of the United Kingdom.
- LIII. An Act for confirming a Scheme of the Charity Commissioners for the Endowed School at *Moulton* in the county of *Lincoln*.
- LIV. An Act to facilitate the Despatch of Business before Grand Juries in *England* and *Wales*.
- LV. An Act for transferring the Powers of the Church Building Commissioners to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for *England*.
- LVI. An Act to constitute the Court of Session the Court of Exchequer in *Scot-*

- land*, and to regulate Procedure in matters connected with the Exchequer.
- LVII. An Act to abolish the Jurisdiction of the Court of the Liberties and Manor of *Saint Sepulchre* in and near *Dublin*, and for the future Regulation of certain Markets of the said Manor.
- LVIII. An Act to amend the Law for the Registration of Persons entitled to vote in the Election of Members to serve in Parliament for Burghs in *Scotland*.
- LIX. An Act to alter the Mode of Providing for certain Expenses now charged upon certain Parts of the Public Revenue.
- LX. An Act to amend the Laws of *Scotland* affecting Trade and Commerce.
- LXI. An Act to continue an Act for the Survey of *Great Britain*, *Berwick-upon-Tweed*, and the *Isle of Man*.
- LXII. An Act to provide for the Maintenance of Navigations made in connection with Drainage, and to make further Provision in relation to Works of Drainage in *Ireland*.
- LXIII. An Act to amend the Acts relating to Grand Juries in *Ireland*.
- LXIV. An Act to repeal certain Statutes which are not in use.
- LXV. An Act to encourage the providing of improved Dwellings for the Labouring Classes in *Ireland*.
- LXVI. An Act to extinguish certain Rights of Way and to stop up certain Roads and Paths near the camp at *Aldershot*.
- LXVII. An Act to extend the Period for applying for a Sale under the Acts for facilitating the Sale and Transfer of Incumbered Estates in *Ireland*, and to amend the said Acts.
- LXVIII. An Act to further amend the Laws relating to Prisons in *Ireland*.
- LXIX. An Act to render more effectual the Police in Counties and Boroughs in *England* and *Wales*.
- LXX. An Act to render valid certain Marriages in the Church at *Coutham* in the Parish of *Kirk Leatham* in the County of *York*.
- LXXI. An Act to continue certain Acts for regulating Turnpike Roads in *Ireland*.
- LXXII. An Act to continue "The Railways Act (*Ireland*) 1851."
- LXXIII. An Act to indemnify such Persons in the United Kingdom as have omitted to qualify themselves for Offices and Employments, and to extend the Time limited for those Purposes respectively.
- LXXIV. An Act to continue the Act to facilitate the Management and Improvement of Episcopal and Capitular Estates in *England*.
- LXXV. An Act for the further Alteration and Amendment of the Laws and Duties of Customs.
- LXXVI. An Act to continue for a limited Time the Exemption of certain Charities from the Operation of the Charitable Trusts Acts.
- LXXVII. An Act to amend the Law and Practice of the Court of Chancery in *Ireland* in relation to the Appointment of Receivers over Real Estate, and to expedite the Sale of Estates in the said Court.
- LXXVIII. An Act to continue the Act of the Second and Third Years of Her Majesty, Chapter Seventy-four, for preventing the administering and taking of unlawful Oaths in *Ireland*, as amended by an Act of the Eleventh and Twelfth Years of Her Majesty's Reign.
- LXXIX. An Act to consolidate and amend the Laws relating to Bankruptcy in *Scotland*.
- LXXX. An Act to grant Relief in assessing the Income Tax on Lands in *Scotland* in respect of certain Public Burdens charged thereon; to alter and regulate the Allowances to Clerks to the Commissioners of Income Tax; and to amend the Laws relating to the Land, Assessed, and Income Taxes, and the Redemption and Purchase of the Land Tax.
- LXXXI. An Act to reduce the Stamp Duties on certain Instruments of Proxy; to amend the Laws relating to the stamping of Articles of Clerkship to Attorneys and others; and to exempt from Stamp Duty Admissions to the Freedom of the City of *London* by Redemption.
- LXXXII. An Act to repeal and reimpose under new Regulations the Duty on Race-horses.
- LXXXIII. An Act to provide for the better Defence of the Coasts of the Realm, and the more ready Manning of the Navy, and to transfer to the Admiralty the Government of the Coast Guard.
- LXXXIV. An Act to continue the Corrupt Practices Prevention Act, 1854.
- LXXXV. An Act to continue the General Board of Health.
- LXXXVI. An Act to abolish the Office of Cursitor Baron of the Exchequer.
- LXXXVII. An Act to amend the Lunatic Asylums Act, 1853.

- LXXXVIII. An Act to make further Provision for the good Government and Extension of the University of *Cambridge*, of the Colleges therein, and of the College of King *Henry the Sixth* at *Eton*.
- LXXXIX. An Act to abolish certain unnecessary Forms in the framing of Deeds in *Scotland*.
- XC. An Act to defray the Charge of the Pay, Clothing, and contingent and other Expenses of the Disembodied Militia in *Great Britain* and *Ireland*; to grant Allowances in certain Cases to Subaltern Officers, Adjutants, Paymasters, Quartermasters, Surgeons, Assistant Surgeons, and Surgeons Mates of the Militia; and to authorise the Employment of the Non-commissioned Officers.
- XCI. An Act to amend and re-enact certain Provisions of an Act of the Fifty-fourth Year of King *George the Third*, relating to Judicial Procedure and Securities for Debts in *Scotland*.
- XCII. An Act to constitute a Court of Appeal in Chancery, and to amend the Law relating to Appeals from the Incumbered Estates Court in *Ireland*.
- XCIII. An Act to constitute all legally qualified Persons in *Scotland* Commissioners of Supply without being named in an Act of Supply.
- XCIV. An Act for the uniform Administration of Intestates' Estates.
- XCV. An Act to give to the University of *Oxford* and to Colleges in the said University, and to the College of *Saint Mary of Winchester* near *Winchester*, Power to sell and Exchange Lands, under certain Conditions.
- XCVI. An Act to amend the Laws of *England* and *Ireland* affecting Trade and Commerce.
- XCVII. An Act for amending the Law of Marriage in *Scotland*.
- XCVIII. An Act to amend the Laws relating to the Burial of the Dead in *Ireland*.
- XCIX. An Act to amend the Acts relating to Lunatic Asylums in *Ireland*, so far as relates to Superannuations.
- C. An Act to amend the Law with respect to the Election of Directors of Joint Stock Banks in *England*.
- CI. An Act to continue certain Acts to prevent the spreading of contagious or infectious Disorders among Sheep, Cattle, and other Animals.
- CII. An Act to further amend the Procedure in and to enlarge the Jurisdiction of the Superior Courts of Common Law in *Ireland*.
- CIII. An Act to make better Provision for the Removal of Nuisances, Regulation of Lodging Houses, and the Health of Towns in *Scotland*.
- CIV. An Act to extend the Provisions of an Act of the Sixth and Seventh Years of Her Majesty, for making better Provision for the Spiritual Care of populous Parishes, and further to provide for the Formation and Endowment of separate and distinct Parishes.
- CV. An Act to apply a Sum out of the Consolidated Fund and the Surplus of Ways and Means to the Service of the Year One thousand eight hundred and fifty-six, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament.
- CVI. An Act to authorise the Inclosure of certain Lands in pursuance of a Special Report of the Inclosure Commissioners for *England* and *Wales*.
- CVII. An Act to amend the Smoke Nuisance Abatement (Metropolis) Act, 1853.
- CVIII. An Act to amend the Acts relating to the County Courts.
- CIX. An Act to amend the Mode of committing Criminal and Vagrant Children to Reformatory and Industrial Schools.
- CX. An Act for the better Regulation of the House of Industry Hospitals and other Hospitals in *Dublin* supported wholly or in part by Parliamentary Grants.
- CXI. An Act for confirming a scheme of the Charity Commissioners for *Stoke Poges* Hospital in the County of *Bucks*, with certain Alterations.
- CXII. An Act to amend the Act of the last Session of Parliament, Chapter One hundred and twenty, for the better Local Management of the Metropolis.
- CXIII. An Act to provide for taking Evidence in Her Majesty's Dominions in relation to Civil and Commercial Matters pending before Foreign Tribunals.
- CXIV. An Act to prevent False Packing and other Frauds in the Hay and Straw Trade.
- CXV. An Act to provide for the Retirement of the present Bishops of *London* and *Durham*.
- CXVI. An Act for the Appointment of a Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education.
- CXVII. An Act to amend the Law re-

lating to the Relief of the Poor in *Scotland*.

CXVIII. An Act to amend the Act of the last Session of Parliament for diminishing Expense and Delay in the Administration of Criminal Justice in certain Cases.

CXIX. An Act to amend the Provisions of the Marriage and Registration Acts.

CXX. An Act to facilitate Leases and Sales of Settled Estates.

LOCAL AND PERSONAL ACTS.

Declared Public, and to be judicially noticed.

- i. **A**N Act to enable the *London Dock* Company to raise a further Sum of Money.
- ii. An Act for supplying with Gas the Townships of *Knottingley* and *Ferrybridge* in the West Riding of the County of *York*.
- iii. An Act to extend the Period limited for the Exercise of the Powers of the Colonial Bank; and for other Purposes.
- iv. An Act for lighting with Gas the Borough of *Weymouth* and *Melcombe Regis*, and its Neighbourhood, in the County of *Dorset*; and for other Purposes.
- v. An Act for vesting in the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of *Liverpool* the Undertaking of the *Chorley Waterworks* Company, and for other Purposes.
- vi. An Act for incorporating the *Lancaster Gaslight* Company, and extending their Powers, and for authorising additional Works, and the raising of further Monies; and for other Purposes.
- vii. An Act to enable the *Hastingsden* and *Rawtenstall* Waterworks Company to raise a further Sum of Money, and for other Purposes.
- viii. An Act to enable the *Southport* Waterworks Company to raise a further Sum of Money, and for other Purposes.
- ix. An Act for the better supplying with Gas the Parish of *Gainsborough* in *Lincolnshire*.
- x. An Act for enabling the Company of Proprietors of *Lambeth Waterworks* to raise further Money, and for other Purposes.

xi. An Act for effecting certain Alterations in the Works of the Tidal Harbour of *Victoria Dock* at *Dundee*, and for other Purposes in relation to the Harbour of *Dundee*.

xii. An Act to enable the *Lincoln Waterworks* Company to raise a further Sum of Money.

xiii. An Act for granting further Powers to the *Heywood Gaslight* and Coke Company.

xiv. An Act for the incorporating of the *Milford Railway* Company, and for the making of the *Milford Railway* in the County of *Pembroke*.

xv. An Act to enable the *Eastern Counties* and *London and Blackwall* Railway Companies to raise a further Sum of Money for the Purposes of the *London, Tilbury, and Southend* Extension Railway; to amend the Acts relating to such Undertaking; and for other Purposes.

xvi. An Act for making a Railway from the *Wilts, Somerset, and Weymouth* Railway, near *Frome*, to *Shepton Mallett* in the County of *Somerset*.

xvii. An Act to confirm an Award for the Settlement of Matters in difference between the University and Borough of *Cambridge*, and for other Purposes connected therewith.

xviii. An Act to enable the *Ulster Railway* Company to subscribe towards the Undertaking of the *Portadown and Dunganannon* Railway Company, and to authorise certain Arrangements between the said Companies, and for other Purposes.

xix. An Act for supplying with Water the Town of *Filey* and the Environs and Neighbourhood thereof, and other places in the East and North Ridings of the County of *York*, and for authorising the purchase of the *Filey Gasworks*, and for supplying the said town with Gas; and for other Purposes.

xx. An Act to empower the *Wakefield Gaslight* Company to raise a further Sum of Money.

xxi. An Act for incorporating the *Worksop Gas* Company.

xxii. An Act to amend and extend the Provisions of "The *Llanidloes and Newtown* Railway Act, 1853;" and to enable the *Llanidloes and Newtown* Railway Company to make certain Deviations in their authorised Line and Levels, and for other Purposes.

xxiii. An Act to confer further Powers

A A

- on the *Boston* Gaslight and Coke Company.
- xxiv. An Act to enable the *East of Fife* Railway Company to make a Deviation in the Line of their Railway and for other Purposes.
- xxv. An Act for continuing the Term and amending and extending the Provisions of the Act relating to the *Leicester and Welford* Turnpike Road, in the Counties of *Leicester* and *Northampton*.
- xxvi. An Act for more effectually paving, cleansing, lighting, and otherwise improving the Town of *Gravesend* in the County of *Kent*.
- xxvii. An Act to enable the *Scarborough* Waterworks Company to raise a further Sum of Money, and to extend the Limits for the Supply of Water, and to amend the Provisions of the Act relating to such Company.
- xxviii. An Act to repeal the Acts relating to the *Sleaford and Tattershall* Turnpike Road, and to make other Provisions in lieu thereof.
- xxix. An Act to confer further Powers on the *Bath* Gaslight and Coke Company.
- xxx. An Act to confer further Powers on the *Cheltenham* Gaslight and Coke Company.
- xxxi. An Act for continuing the Term and amending the Provisions of the Act for making and maintaining a Turnpike Road from the Town of *Crowland* in the County of *Lincoln* to the Town of *Eye* in the County of *Northampton*.
- xxxii. An Act to extend the Municipal Boundaries of the City of *Edinburgh*, to transfer the Powers of the Commissioners of Police to the Magistrates and Council, and for other purposes relating to the Municipality of the said City.
- xxxiii. An Act to authorise the *Cork and Youghal* Railway Company to extend their Railway into *Cork*, and for other Purposes.
- xxxiv. An Act for altering the Name of the *Banbridge, Newry, Dublin, and Belfast Junction* Railway Company to the Name "The *Banbridge Junction* Railway Company," for increasing their Capital and extending their Powers, and for other purposes.
- xxxv. An Act for enlarging and improving the Justiciary Court House, and Court Houses and Public Buildings of the City of *Glasgow* and County of *Lanark*, for erecting additional Buildings, for amending the Act relating thereto, and for other purposes.
- xxxvi. An Act for making better Provision for supplying the districts of *Dewsbury*, *Batley*, and *Heckmondwike* with Water, and for confirming an Agreement between the Local Boards of Health of those Districts; and for other Purposes.
- xxxvii. An Act for the Continuance and Regulation of the *Kettering and Newport Pagnell* Turnpike Road Trust.
- xxxviii. An Act to amend the Provisions and extend the Limits of the Act relating to the City of *Coventry* Gaslight Company.
- xxxix. An Act to authorise the making of a Turnpike Road from the Township of *Thornaby* to *Middlesbrough* in the North Riding of the County of *York*, with a Bridge over a Creek or Arm of the River *Tees*, and for other Purposes.
- xl. An Act to authorise the making of a Railway from the *Great North of Scotland* Railway to *Alford* in the County of *Aberdeen*, to be called "The *Alford Valley* Railway."
- xli. An Act to amend "The *Saint Ives and West Cornwall Junction* Railway Act, 1853."
- xlii. An Act to make further Provision for supplying with Water the Borough of *Shrewsbury* in the County of *Salop*.
- xliii. An Act to amend an Act passed in the 7th and 8th Years of the Reign of His late Majesty King *George* the Fourth, intituled *An Act to alter, amend, and enlarge the Powers and Provisions of an Act relating to the Road from Barnsdale through Pontefract to Thwaite Gate near Leeds in the West Riding of the County of York*, and to continue the Term thereby granted.
- xliv. An Act for regulating the Capital of the *Fleetwood, Preston, and West Riding Junction* Railway Company, for making further Provision with respect to tolls to be taken on the Railway, and for other purposes.
- xlv. An Act for making a Railway from the *Chester and Holyhead* Railway at or near to *Rhyl* in the County of *Flint* to the Town of *Denbigh* in the County of *Denbigh*, to be called "The *Vale of Clwyd* Railway."
- xlvi. An Act to discontinue the taking of Toll on the Turnpike Roads leading from the Town of *Antrim* towards *Colevaine*, and to provide for the future Maintenance of such Roads.
- xlvi. An Act to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the *Shrewsbury and*

Hereford Railway Company, to enable that Company to raise further Sums of Money, to acquire additional Lands; and for other Purposes.

xlvi. An Act to enable the Mayor, Alderman, and Burgesses of the Borough of *Cork* to remove certain Bridges, and to build new Bridges in lieu thereof; to confirm certain Arrangements with the *Cork* Pipe Water Trustees; to provide the necessary Funds for affording an improved Supply of Water at *Cork*; to alter, amend, and enlarge certain Powers and Provisions of the *Cork* Improvement Act, 1852; and for other Purposes.

xlix. An Act to amend and extend the Provisions of the several Acts relating to the *Knaresbrough and Green Hammerton* Turnpike Road in the County of *York*, and to create a further Term therein; and for other purposes.

l. An Act to amend and extend the Provisions of the Act relating to the *Knaresbrough and Pateley Bridge* Turnpike Road, and to create a further Term therein, and for other Purposes.

li. An Act for regulating the Capital and Mortgage Debt of the *Eastern Counties* Railway Company, and for other Purposes.

lii. An Act for extending the Time for the Completion of the Works authorised by "The *Hampstead Junction* Railway Act, 1853."

liii. An Act for making a Railway from *Lowestoft* to join the *East Suffolk* Railway in the Parish of *Beccles*, all in the County of *Suffolk*, and for other Purposes connected therewith.

liv. An Act to enable the *Midland* Railway Company to raise additional Capital, and for other Purposes.

lv. An Act for more effectually repairing the Road from *Barnby Moor* in the County of *Nottingham* to *Maltby* in the County of *York*, and from *Whiston* to *Rotherham* in the said County of *York*.

lvi. An Act for better Paving the City of *Glasgow*, and for other purposes in relation to the Statute Labour of the said City.

lvii. An Act for the Transfer of the *Wolverhampton* Waterworks to the *Wolverhampton New Waterworks* Company, and for other Purposes.

lviii. An Act for repairing the Road from *Blackburn* in the County Palatine of *Lancaster* to *Addingham* and *Cocking End* in the West Riding of the County of *York*, and the Road from *Old Accrington* to its Junction with such Road

in *Habergham Eaves* in the said County of *Lancaster*.

lix. An Act to incorporate "The *West Ham* Gas Company," to enable them to raise further Money, to confirm a Contract between the said Company and the *Commercial* Gas Company, and for other Purposes.

lx. An Act to continue the *Honiton and Sidmouth* Turnpike Trust, and for other Purposes.

lxi. An Act for making a Railway from the *Chappel* Station of the *Colchester, Stour Valley, Sudbury, and Halstead* Railway to *Halstead* in the County of *Essex*, and for other Purposes.

lxii. An Act to incorporate "The *Wandsworth and Putney* Gaslight and Coke Company," and for other Purposes.

lxiii. An Act to authorise the *North British* Railway Company to raise more Money, and to build a Bridge over *Leith Wynd* in *Edinburgh*, and for other Purposes.

lxiv. An Act for more effectually repairing the Road from *Penrith* to *Cockermouth*, and other Roads connected therewith, and for making and maintaining several new Roads, all in the County of *Cumberland*.

lxv. An Act to consolidate the Drainage Trusts in *Deeping Fen* in the County of *Lincoln*, and for other Purposes relating to the said Fen.

lxvi. An Act for more effectually repairing certain Roads in the County of *Chester*, of which the Short Title is "*Stockport and Warrington* Road Act, 1856."

lxvii. An Act for enlarging and improving the *Elgin and Lossiemouth* Harbour, for raising a further Sum of Money, and for other Purposes.

lxviii. An Act to enable the *Carmarthen and Cardigan* Railway Company to make a Deviation of a Portion of their Line of Railway, and to abandon Parts thereof, and to grant further Powers to the Company; and for other Purposes.

lxix. An Act to enable the *Luton, Dunstable, and Welwyn Junction* Railway Company to alter the present authorised Junction of their Railway with the *Leighton Buzzard and Dunstable* Branch of the *London and North-western* Railway; and for other Purposes.

lxx. An Act for incorporating the *Scottish* Drainage and Improvement Company, and to afford greater Facilities for the Improvement of Land in *Scotland*.

lxxi. An Act for making a Railway from *Lymington* in the County of *Southampton*

- to the *London and South-western Railway* at *Brockenhurst* in the same County, to be called the "*Lymington Railway*," with a Landing Place at *Lymington* aforesaid, and for other Purposes.
- lxxii. An Act to repeal the Acts relating to the *Brough and Egmont Bridge Turnpike Road*, and to make other Provisions in lieu thereof.
- lxxiii. An Act to renew the Term, and continue, amend, and enlarge the Powers of an Act passed in the Third Year of the Reign of His Majesty King *George the Fourth*, intituled *An Act for repairing and amending the Roads from Donington High Bridge to Hale Drove, and to the Eighth Milestone in the Parish of Wigtoft, and to Langret Ferry in the County of Lincoln*.
- lxxiv. An Act for supplying with Water the Inhabitants of *Clay Cross*, and the Neighbourhood, in the County of *Derby*.
- lxxv. An Act for making a Railway from *Sittingbourne* to *Sheerness*, all in the County of *Kent*; and for other Purposes.
- lxxvi. An Act to enable the *Eastern Counties and London and Blackwall Railway Companies* to extend the *London, Tilbury, and Southend Extension Railway* to the *London and Blackwall Railway*, with Branches therefrom, and to authorise certain Arrangements with reference thereto; and for other Purposes.
- lxxvii. An Act to authorise the Division of the Borough of *Middlesbrough* into Wards; to enable the Local Board of Health of the District of *Middlesbrough* to purchase Gasworks and light the District, and to enlarge the Market Place; to enable the Corporation to establish a public Wharf, and a Passage over the River *Tees*; to confer other Powers on the Local Board and the Corporation, and for other Purposes.
- lxxviii. An Act for the better Supply of the Town of *Torquay* and the Neighbourhood thereof with Water, and for other Purposes.
- lxxix. An Act for making a Railway from *Yarmouth* to the *East Suffolk Railway* in the Parish of *Haddiscoe*, with a Branch Railway connected therewith, and for other Purposes.
- lxxx. An Act to sanction a Supply of Water to the Town and Neighbourhood of *Leeds* from the River *Wharfe*.
- lxxxxi. An Act to attach further Advantages to certain Portions of the Capital of the *Eastern Union Railway Company*.
- lxxxii. An Act to repeal *An Act for amending and maintaining the Turnpike Road from Bawtry, through the Town of Tinsley, to the Road from Rotherham to Sheffield in the West Riding of the County of York*, and to make other Provisions in lieu thereof.
- lxxxiii. An Act for continuing the Term and amending and extending the Provisions of the Act relating to the *Godley Lane Turnpike Road* in the West Riding of the County of *York*.
- lxxxiv. An Act to repeal the Act relating to the Turnpike Roads from *Halifax* to *Huddersfield* in the West Riding of the County of *York*, and to grant a further Term in the said Roads, and further Powers for the Management thereof, and other Purposes.
- lxxxv. An Act for carrying into effect certain Arrangements between the Trustees of the *Renfrewshire Turnpike Roads* and the Lord Provost, Magistrates, and Council, and Police and Statute Labour Committee, of *Glasgow*; and for continuing in other respects the Acts relating to the said Roads.
- lxxxvi. An Act to enable the *Morayshire Railway Company* to construct a Railway from *Orton* to *Craigellachie*, and for other Purposes.
- lxxxvii. An Act for authorising Traffic Arrangements between the *West End of London and Crystal Palace* and the *London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Companies*, the Regulation and Increase of Capital, and for other Purposes.
- lxxxviii. An Act to afford Facilities to the *Bagenalstown and Wexford Railway Company* for raising the Funds necessary to enable them to execute their Undertaking, and for other Purposes.
- lxxxix. An Act for more effectually repairing several Roads leading to and from the Town of *Monmouth*, and for making several Lines of Road to communicate therewith, in the Counties of *Monmouth, Gloucester, and Hereford*.
- xc. An Act for the Improvement of Part of the District of *St. Peter Bournemouth*, in the Parishes of *Christchurch and Holdenhurst* in the County of *Southampton*, and for providing a Pier there.
- xci. An Act for better supplying with Water the City of *Edinburgh* and Town and Port of *Leith* and Places adjacent.

- xcii. An Act for making a Railway from the *Epsom* Branch of the *London, Brighton, and South Coast* Railway at *Epsom* to *Leatherhead*.
- xciii. An Act for incorporating the *Salisbury* Railway and Market House Company; for authorising them to make and maintain a Railway and a Market House at *Salisbury*; and for other Purposes.
- xciv. An Act for making a Railway from the *Stocksfield* Station of the *Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Carlisle* Railway to the *Stockton and Darlington* Railway, near *Conside* Ironworks, with a Branch to the *Derwent* Iron Company's Railway; and for other Purposes.
- xcv. An Act to enable the *Swansea Vale* Railway Company to make Extension and Branch Railways, and for other Purposes.
- xcvi. An Act to repeal the Act for more effectually making, straightening, repairing, and improving the Roads from near the Town of *Lewes* to *Polegate*, in the Parish of *Hailsham*, and from thence to *Eastbourne*, and to *Polegate* to *Hailsham Common*, in the County of *Sussex*, and to make other Provisions in lieu thereof.
- xcvii. An Act for making and maintaining a Turnpike Road from *Conway* to *Llandudno*, in the County of *Carnarvon*, and for other Purposes.
- xcviii. An Act for making a Railway from *Dunfermline* to *Killairnie* with a Branch to *Kingseat* in the County of *Fife*, to be called "The *West of Fife Mineral* Railway."
- xcix. An Act for making a Railway from the Town of *Maybole* to the Town and Harbour of *Girvan*, to be called "The *Maybole and Girvan* Railway."
- c. An Act for making a Railway from the *South Wales* Railway near *Brimspill* in the Parish of *Awre* to *Howbeach Valley* in the *Forest of Dean*, with Branches and for other Purposes.
- ci. An Act for incorporating the *Ceylon* Railway Company, and for other Purposes connected therewith.
- cii. An Act for enabling the *Somerset Central* Railway Company to construct a Railway from *Glastonbury* to near *Bruton*, and for other Purposes.
- ciii. An Act for more effectually repairing the Road leading from *Wem* to the Lime Rocks at *Bronygarth* in the County of *Salop*, and for making several Lines of Road connected with the same in the Counties of *Salop* and *Denbigh*.
- civ. An Act for continuing the Term and amending and extending the Provisions of the Act relating to the *Cleobury North and Ditton Priors* District and the *Cleobury Mortimer* District of Turnpike Roads, in the Counties of *Salop* and *Worcester*.
- cv. An Act for authorising a Lease of the *Wimbledon and Croydon* Railway, and for authorising the Purchase of additional Lands and the raising of additional capital by the *Wimbledon and Croydon* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.
- cvi. An Act to enable the *Stirling and Dunfermline* Railway Company to create additional Shares in their Undertaking; and for other Purposes.
- cvi. An Act to amend the Constitution of "The *London* Printing and Publishing Company, Limited."
- cvi. An Act to amend certain Acts relating to the *Luton* District Turnpike Road, and make other Provisions in lieu thereof.
- cix. An Act to extend the Times limited for certain Purposes by the Acts relating to the *Metropolitan* Railway, and to enable the *Metropolitan* Railway Company to form a Junction with the *Great Northern* Railway, and for other Purposes.
- cx. An Act for making a Railway from the Town of *Nairn* to the Town of *Keith*.
- cxi. An Act for authorising Deviations from the authorised Line of the *Severn Valley* Railway, and for making further Provision with respect to Shares in the Capital of the *Severn Valley* Railway Company, and for facilitating the Completion of their Undertaking, and for other Purposes.
- cxii. An Act for establishing and maintaining a Ferry and Floating Bridge between *Stokes Bay* and *Ryde* in the County of *Southampton*, with Landing Places and Approaches thereto.
- cxiii. An Act for making a Railway from the *Scottish Central* Railway at *Dunblane* by *Doune* to *Callander*, to be called "The *Dunblane, Doune, and Callander* Railway."
- cxiv. An Act for making a Railway from *Castle Douglas*, by *Dalbeattie* to the *Glasgow and South Western* Railway at *Dumfries*, and for other Purposes.
- cxv. An Act for granting further Powers for lighting, cleansing, sewerage, and improving the Borough of *Leeds*, and for other Purposes.
- cxvi. An Act for regulating the Rates and Charges to be taken by the *Grand Junc-*

- tion Waterworks Company for a Supply of Water to Parts of the Parish of Pad-dington, and for other Purposes.*
- cxvii. An Act to grant further Powers to the *Crystal Palace Company* for the raising of Capital, for the internal Management of their Undertaking, and with respect to *Dulwich Wood*.
- cxviii. An Act to consolidate the Powers of the *Gloucester Gaslight Company*, to enable them to raise Money, and for other Purposes.
- cxix. An Act for the making of a Dock and Works at *Thames Haven*, and for other Purposes.
- cxx. An Act for the making by the *London and South Western Railway Company* of a Railway from *Yeovil to Exeter*, to be called "*The Exeter Extension Railway*;" and for other Purposes.
- cxxi. An Act to amend the Acts relating to the *East Indian Railway Company*.
- cxii. An Act for making a Railway from the *Taff Vale Railway* to the River *Ely* in the County of *Glamorgan*; for converting part of the said River into a tidal Harbour, and regulating the Access thereto; for authorising Arrangements with the *Taff Vale Railway Company*; and for other Purposes.
- cxiii. An Act for altering the *Crewe and Shrewsbury Line* of the *London and North-western Railway*, for making Provision with respect to Station Accommodation at *Shrewsbury*, and for other Purposes.
- cxiv. An Act to enable the *Londonderry and Enniskillen Railway Company* to create Preference Shares with Priority of Dividend over all the existing Shares of the Company; and for other Purposes.
- cxv. An Act for making a Railway from the authorised Line of the *West End of London and Crystal Palace Railway* (Extension to *Bromley and Farnborough*) at *Shortlands* in the Parish of *Beckenham* in the County of *Kent* to *St. Mary Cray* in the same County.
- cxvi. An Act to enable the *Oxford, Worcester and Wolverhampton Railway Company* to raise further Money for the Completion of the Broad Gauge, and for other purposes, and to convert their Mortgage Debt into Stock.
- cxvii. An Act to repeal an Act passed in the Fourth Year of the Reign of His late Majesty King *George the Fourth*, intituled *An Act for more effectually amending and keeping in repair the Roads from the Town of Uttoxeter to the Town of Newcastle-under-Lyme in the County of Stafford, so far as relates to the Uttoxeter District of the said Roads, and for making certain new Pieces of Road to communicate therewith, all in the said County of Stafford*, and to confer larger and additional Powers and Provisions in lieu of those therein contained; and for other Purposes.
- cxviii. An Act to amend *An Act for draining, embanking, and improving the Fen Lands and Low Grounds within the Parishes, Hamlets, Townships, or Places of Bardney, Southrow, otherwise Southry, Topholme, Bucknall, Horsington, Stixwold Edlington, and Thimbleby, in the County of Lincoln*, and to confer further Powers on the Commissioners under such Act; and for other Purposes.
- cxix. An Act to revive and extend certain of the Powers of the *Waveney Valley Railway Company* with relation to their Railway.
- cxx. An Act for authorising the Abandonment of Parts of the authorised Lines of the *Westminster Terminus Railway*, and the making of other Lines of Railway in lieu thereof, and for reducing the Capital of the *Westminster Terminus Railway Company*; and for other Purposes.
- xxxi. An Act to render more effectual the Powers of raising Money given by "*The Severn Navigation Act, 1853*," and for other Purposes.
- xxxi. An Act for making a Railway from the *Oswestry and Newtown Railway* in the Parish of *Buttington* in the County of *Montgomery* to *Shrewsbury*, with a Branch thereout to *Minsterley* in the County of *Salop*, and for other Purposes.
- xxxi. An Act for extending the Operations of the Society for the Discharge and Relief of Persons imprisoned for small Debts throughout *England and Wales*.
- xxxi. An Act to unite and amalgamate the Undertaking of the *Scottish Midland Junction Railway Company* with the Undertaking of the *Aberdeen Railway Company*, to be thenceforth called "*The Scottish North Eastern Railway Company*," and to regulate the Management of and confer additional Powers on the United Company, and for other Purposes.
- xxxi. An Act for making a Railway from the *Southampton and Dorchester Railway* to *Blandford St. Mary* in the County of *Dorset*, and for other Purposes.

cxixvi. An Act for making a Railway from the *Scottish Midland Junction* Railway near the *Dunkeld* Road Bridge to *Methven* in the County of *Perth*.

cxixvii. An Act to extend the Time limited for completing the *Oxford, Worcester, and Wolverhampton* Railway, and for adapting the same to the Broad Gauge, and for other Purposes.

cxixviii. An Act to provide for the Arrangement of the Financial Affairs of the City of *Perth*, for the Maintenance of the Port and Harbour, and for other Purposes therewith connected.

cxixix. An Act to enable the *Scottish Central Railway Company* to make Branch Railways to the Town of *Denny* in the County of *Stirling*.

PRIVATE ACTS.

Printed by the Queen's Printer, and whereof the printed Copies may be given in Evidence.

1. **A**N Act to amend an Act made and passed in the Tenth Year of the Reign of Her present Majesty, intituled *An Act to divide the Parish and Rectory of Doddington otherwise Dornington into Three separate and distinct Parishes and Rectories, and to endow the same out of the Revenues of that Rectory, and to make Provisions for the further Division of such Rectories and Parishes, and for other Purposes connected therewith.*

2. An Act for continuing in force, during the Minority of Mrs. *Clara Clarke Thornhill*, the Wife of *William Capel Clarke Thornhill* of *Swakeleys* in the County of *Middlesex*, Esquire, the Powers conferred by "*Thornhill's Estate Act, 1852,*" and "*Thornhill's Estate Act, 1854,*" and for other Purposes.

3. An Act for authorising the Trustees under the Will of *William Wainman* Esquire, deceased, to grant Leases, and to make Sales, Exchanges, and Partition of the Real Estates devised by or subject to the Trusts of the same Will; and for other Purposes.

4. An Act for giving effect to a Compromise relating to the Estate of the Most Noble *George Fourth Duke of Marlborough*, deceased, and, with a view thereto, for extinguishing the demisable Quality of certain Copyhold Heredita-

ments, Parcels of the Manors comprised in the Estates and Hereditaments settled on the Dukedom, and for creating a Term of Years in a Portion of the said Copyhold Hereditaments.

5. An Act to authorise *Lionel Milborne Swinnerton* Baronet and his Issue to assume and bear the Surname of *Pilkington* jointly with the Surnames of *Milborne* and *Swinnerton*, and to be called by the Surnames of *Milborne Swinnerton Pilkington*.

6. An Act for vesting in Trustees the undivided Parts, subject to the Limitations of the Wills of *Benjamin Ingham* deceased, and *Joshua Ingham* deceased respectively, of Estates in the West Riding of the County of *York*, and for authorising Partitions of Parts of those Estates, and for authorising Leases and Sales of Parts of those Estates, and for other Purposes.

7. An Act to authorise the granting of Leases of Parts of the Freehold, Copyhold, and Leasehold Estates of the late *Leonard Lewen Wheatley*, Esquire, situate in the several Parishes of *Saint Lawrence* and *Saint Peter the Apostle* in the Isle of *Thanet*, of *Meopham near Gravesend*, and *Ash next Sandwich*, and elsewhere in the County of *Kent*, and within the Manor of *Stepney* otherwise *Stebunheath Ratcliffe* in the Parish of *Saint Dunstan, Stepney*, and elsewhere in the County of *Middlesex*.

8. An Act to enable the Trustees of the Will of *Matthew Butterwick* Esquire, to sell the Rectory and Tithes of *Thirsk*, held by Lease for Lives under the Archbishop of *York*, and certain Policies of Assurance, and for the Investment of the Proceeds, and for other Purposes: of which the Short Title is "*Butterwick's Estate Act, 1856.*"

9. An Act for enabling Leases for Mining, Agricultural and Building Purposes to be made of the Estates of *John Walmesley* Esquire, deceased, and Sales of Portions thereof, and for other Purposes: the Short title of which is "*Walmesley's Estate Act, 1856.*"

10. An Act for enabling Leases and Sales to be made of Lands and Hereditaments in the Counties of *Northumberland* and *Durham* belonging to the Families of *Thoroton* and *Croft*, and for other Purposes: called "*The Thoroton and Croft Estate Act, 1856.*"

11. An Act for vesting in Trustees the Estates of the late *Sarah Reddall*, deceased, situate in the County of *North-*

- ampton*, known as the *Dallington* Estate, for the Purpose of enabling Leases, Sales, Exchanges, and Partitions to be made of the same; and for other Purposes.
12. An Act to enable the Trustees of the Will of *John Bell*, Esquire, to sell a Leasehold Estate for Lives in the County of *York*, known as "*Wildon Grange*," held of the Archbishop of *York*, and for the Re-investment of the Proceeds in the Purchase of Real Estates of Inheritance; of which the Short Title is "*Bell's Estate Act, 1856.*"
13. An Act to amend and enlarge the Powers of an Act passed in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Years of the Reign of Her present Majesty Queen *Victoria*, intituled *An Act for authorising the Trustees of the late Thomas Gordon to sell his Estates of Cairness and others in the County of Aberdeen, and to apply the Price thereof in Payment of the Debts and Burdens affecting the same, and for laying out the Residue of the Price in the Purchase of other Lands to be entailed, in Terms of the Trust Deed*
- of Settlement by the said Thomas Gordon; and for other Purposes.*
14. An Act for enabling Partitions, Sales, Exchanges and Leases to be made of certain Parts of the Estates devised by the Will of Sir *John William Head Brydges* deceased, and for other Purposes.

PRIVATE ACTS,
Not Printed.

15. An Act to enable *George Shipton*, Clerk, to exercise his Office of Priest, and to hold any Benefice or Preferment in the United Church of *England* and *Ireland*.
16. An Act to dissolve the Marriage of *John Talbot*, Esquire, with *Marianne* his now Wife, and to enable him to marry again: and for other Purposes.
17. An Act to dissolve the Marriage of *Madgwick Spicer Davidson*, Gentleman, with *Katherine Anne* his now Wife, and to enable the said *Madgwick Spicer Davidson* to marry again; and for other Purposes therein mentioned.

PRICES OF STOCK IN EACH MONTH IN 1856.

HIGHEST AND LOWEST.

	Bank Stock.	3 per Cent. Red.	3 per Cent. Consols.	New 3 per Cent.	Long Annuities.	India Stock.	India Bonds.	Ex. Bills £1000.	Bank of England.	
									Note Circ.	Bullion.
January	{ 212 206½	92½ 86¼	91½ 86	92½ 86½	3½ 3½	224 218	par 10 dis.	par 12 dis.	£ 24,421,180 24,173,580	£ 9,946,180 9,698,580
February	{ 215½ 213	92½ 90⅞	92½ 90⅞	93½ 91⅞	3½ 3½	226 221	1 dis. 10 dis.	2 pm. 10 dis.	24,532,620 24,367,835	10,057,620 9,892,835
March	{ 215 215	92¼ 91¾	93¼ 91¼	93¼ 92¼	3½ 3½	225 224½	2 dis. 12 dis.	5 pm. 2 dis.	24,428,230 24,221,825	9,953,230 9,746,825
April	{ 215 211½	92⅞ 91	93½ 92¼	93½ 91⅞	3½ 3½	231 229	3 dis. 10 dis.	4 pm. 5 dis.	23,915,280 23,556,675	9,440,280 9,081,675
May	{ 217 210½	93¼ 91⅞	94⅞ 92½	94½ 91⅞	3½ 3½	236 227	par 9 dis.	5 pm. 10 dis.	25,241,040 23,633,820	10,766,040 9,158,820
June	{ 218 216½	95¼ 93	94⅞ 94¼	96¼ 93¼	3½ 3½	236 233	15 pm. 1 pm.	15 pm. 3 pm.	26,903,970 25,532,095	12,428,970 11,057,095
July	{ 218½ 216	96¼ 95¾	95⅞ 95½	97 96¼	3½ 3½	236 232½	25 pm. 15 pm.	24 pm. 11 pm.	26,499,365 26,183,930	12,024,365 11,708,930
August	{ 219½ 217	96¼ 95¼	95⅞ 94⅞	96½ 95⅞	3½ 3½	236 233	22 pm. 10 pm.	19 pm. 8 pm.	26,307,590 26,188,315	11,832,590 11,713,315
September	{ 220 219½	95½ 95¼	95¼ 93½	95⅞ 95⅞	233½ 229½	17 pm. 13 pm.	17 pm. 7 pm.	26,015,080 25,603,940	11,540,080 11,128,940
October	{ 214 211½	91½ 90¼	92½ 91¼	92 91¼	2½ 2½	228½ 226	14 pm. 2 pm.	12 pm. 1 dis.	24,701,745 23,538,205	10,226,745 9,063,205
November	{ 217 213	93¼ 91⅞	94⅞ 92¼	93½ 91½	2½ 2½	227½ 225	4 pm. 2 dis.	5 pm. 2 dis.	24,269,930 23,389,805	9,794,930 8,914,805
December	{ 218½ 215½	94½ 93	94⅞ 94⅞	94⅞ 93½	2½ 2½	227 225	2 pm. 2 dis.	8 pm. 2 dis.	24,525,995 24,112,390	10,050,995 9,637,390

FINANCE ACCOUNTS

- CLASS I. PUBLIC INCOME.
- II. PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.
- III. DISPOSITION OF GRANTS.

I.—ACCOUNT OF THE INCOME OF THE UNITED KINGDOM,									
HEADS OF REVENUE.			GROSS RECEIPT.			Repayments, Allowances, Discounts, Drawbacks, Bounties, &c.			NET RECEIPT within the Year, after deducting REPAYMENTS, &c.
			£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£ s. d.
Customs			23,481,817	15	6	268,020	15	0	23,213,797 0 6
Excise			18,355,449	4	9	723,310	10	5	17,632,138 14 4
Stamps			7,296,764	17	1½	233,154	16	0½	7,063,610 1 1
Taxes, Land and Assessed			3,140,465	16	3	4,388	10	4¼	3,136,077 5 10¾
Income and Property			15,402,901	14	11½	243,444	0	7	15,159,457 14 4½
Post Office			2,793,870	10	0¾	26,669	5	1½	2,767,201 4 11¼
Crown Lands			421,715	1	1		421,715 1 1
Miscellaneous			1,158,147	19	8		1,158,147 19 8
TOTALS			72,051,132	19	4¾	1,498,987	17	6¼	70,552,145 1 10½

II.—PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.

AN ACCOUNT of the NET PUBLIC INCOME of the United Kingdom of GREAT BRITAIN and IRELAND, (after abating the Expenditure for Collection and Management thereof defrayed by the several clusive of the Sums applied to the Redemption of FUNDED or paying off UNFUNDED DEBT,

INCOME.	In the Year ended 30th June, 1855.	In the Year ended 30th Sept., 1855.	In the Year ended 31st Dec., 1855.	In the Year ended 31st Mar., 1855.
	£	£	£	£
Customs	20,868,986	21,069,654	20,987,752	21,788,770
Excise	16,700,619	16,482,400	16,389,486	16,636,669
Stamps	6,973,355	6,829,252	6,805,604	6,894,307
Land and Assessed Taxes	2,916,609	2,911,302	2,945,784	2,958,626
Property Tax	11,355,126	13,376,733	13,718,185	14,814,756
Post Office	1,209,423	1,127,180	1,137,219	1,171,696
Crown Lands	270,571	275,515	280,515	281,515
Small Branches of the Hereditary Revenue	7,518	7,258	61,056	59,664
Fees of Public Offices	58,611	72,208	96,456	106,133
Contribution from the East India Company	60,360,824	62,151,507	62,422,061	64,712,140
Trustees of the King of the Belgians	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000
Old Stores and Extra Receipts of Naval and Military Departments	34,000	34,000	34,000	34,000
Unclaimed Dividends received	488,746	538,109	522,138	527,377
Miscellaneous Receipts	115,149	115,149	115,149	98,741
	95,119	91,813	211,255	272,232
Excess of Expenditure over Income	61,153,840	62,990,580	63,364,605	65,704,490
	11,901,331	15,514,973	21,141,183	22,723,854
	73,055,171	78,505,553	84,505,788	88,428,345

FOR THE YEAR 1856.

CLASS IV. PUBLIC FUNDED DEBT.

V. UNFUNDED DEBT.

VI. TRADE AND NAVIGATION.

FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31ST MARCH, 1856.

TOTAL INCOME, including BALANCES.	PAYMENTS out of the Income, in its Progress to the Exchequer.	PAYMENTS into the EXCHEQUER.	BALANCES and BILLS and ADVANCES Repayable from Votes outstanding 31st March, 1856.*	TOTAL Discharge of the Income.
£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
23,977,359 2 6	207,033 13 3	23,034,029 0 7	736,296 8 8	23,977,359 2 6
44,081,249 17 6	406,534 12 11½	17,117,373 9 6 7,076,010 13 3 3,100,031 1 8 15,070,958 2 9	1,310,341 17 4	44,081,249 17 6
3,488,084 3 0¾	53,494 5 2	2,757,752 17 10	676,837 0 0	3,488,084 3 0¾
466,940 13 1	134,210 1 2	281,515 15 9	51,214 16 2	466,940 13 1
1,158,147 19 8	1,158,147 19 8	1,158,147 19 8
73,171,781 15 9¾	801,272 12 6¾	69,595,819 1 0	2,774,690 18 3	73,171,781 15 9¾

* Balances, Bills, and Advances, 31st March, 1855, £2,619,336 13s. 11d.

II.—PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.

in the Years ended 30th June, 1855, 30th September, 1855, 31st December, 1855, and 31st March, 1856 (Revenue Departments), and of the ACTUAL ISSUES OR PAYMENTS within the same Periods, and of the ADVANCES and REPAYMENTS for LOCAL WORKS, &c.

EXPENDITURE.	In the Year ended 30th June, 1855.	In the Year ended 30th Sept., 1855.	In the Year ended 31st Dec., 1855.	In the Year ended 31st Mar., 1856.
	£	£	£	£
Debt :				
Interest and Management of the Public Debt	23,044,877	23,106,833	22,792,594	23,205,392
Terminable Annuities	3,850,370	3,836,563	3,868,293	3,863,907
Unclaimed Dividends	157,766	142,494	173,240	173,240
Interest of Exchequer Bonds, 1854	210,000	210,000	217,000	210,000
Ditto Exchequer Bills, Supply	560,635	560,635	560,635	616,083
Ditto ditto Deficiency	21,558	14,379	9,386	17,450
Ditto ditto Ways and Means	18,221	29,205	26,749	26,749
Consolidated Fund :				
Civil List	396,965	396,867	396,570	396,457
Annuities and Pensions	342,906	341,054	340,991	340,491
Salaries and Allowances	171,901	143,342	162,697	161,731
Diplomatic Salaries and Pensions	151,005	150,738	149,244	147,659
Courts of Justice	367,178	298,987	493,082	493,219
Miscellaneous Charges	184,354	177,520	182,118	183,860
Supply Services :				
Army	9,890,059	11,145,059	14,545,059	17,395,059
Navy	17,528,008	18,149,708	19,014,708	19,654,585
Ordnance	6,442,790	8,477,790	9,632,290	10,411,543
Vote of Credit, War with Russia	3,000,000	4,370,000	5,200,000	4,200,000
Civil Services	6,716,572	6,954,372	6,741,126	6,930,912
	73,055,171	78,505,553	84,505,788	88,428,345

REVENUE A N D E X P E N D I T U R E .

An Account of the TOTAL REVENUE of GREAT BRITAIN and IRELAND
Allowances, Discounts, Drawbacks and Bounties in the nature
of the UNITED KINGDOM, exclusive of the Sums applied to the

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Balances and Bills and Advances re- payable from Votes, outstanding on the 31st March, 1855	2,619,636	13	11 $\frac{1}{4}$
Customs	23,213,797	0	6			
Excise	17,632,138	14	4			
Stamps	7,063,610	1	1			
Taxes (Land and Assessed)	3,136,077	5	10 $\frac{3}{4}$			
Income and Property Tax	15,159,457	14	4 $\frac{1}{2}$			
Post Office	2,767,201	4	11 $\frac{1}{4}$			
Crown Lands	421,715	1	1			
Miscellaneous	1,158,147	19	8			
				70,552,145	1	10 $\frac{1}{2}$
				73,171,781	15	9 $\frac{3}{4}$
Deduct,—Balances and Bills, out- standing on the 31st of March, 1856	1,671,594	3	1 $\frac{1}{2}$			
Advances repayable from Votes of Parliament, outstanding on the 31st of March, 1856	1,103,095	19	1 $\frac{1}{2}$			
				2,774,690	2	3
				70,397,091	13	6 $\frac{3}{4}$
Excess of Expenditure over Income				22,723,854	5	1
Excess of Expenditure as above . .	22,723,854	5	1			
Balances and Bills, 31st of March, 1856 £1,671,594	3	1 $\frac{1}{2}$				
Balances and Bills, 31st of March, 1855 1,517,806	11	10 $\frac{1}{2}$				
	153,787	11	3			
Actual Excess of Expenditure over Income	22,570,066	13	10			
				93,120,945	18	7 $\frac{3}{4}$

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE.

in the Year ended 31st March, 1856, after deducting the Repayments, of Drawbacks; together with an Account of the PUBLIC EXPENDITURE Reduction of the NATIONAL DEBT within the same period.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Payments out of the Income in its progress to the Exchequer . . .	801,272	12	6 $\frac{3}{4}$			
Less, Hereditary Pensions redeemed	213,177	1	2			
				588,095	11	4 $\frac{3}{4}$
<i>Public Debt.</i>						
Interest and Management of the Permanent Debt	23,205,392	13	2			
Terminable Annuities	3,863,907	0	9			
Unclaimed Dividends repaid	173,240	17	5			
Interest of Exchequer Bonds, 1854	210,000	0	0			
Do. do. Bills, Supply	616,083	7	5			
Do. do. Deficiency	17,450	16	8			
Do. do. Ways and Means	26,749	13	9			
				28,112,824	9	2
Civil List	396,457	10	0			
Annuities and Pensions	340,491	3	6			
Salaries and Allowances	161,731	18	11			
Diplomatic Salaries and Pensions . .	147,659	7	8			
Courts of Justice	493,219	3	0			
Miscellaneous Charges on the Consolidated Fund	183,860	16	8			
				1,723,419	19	9
Army, Commissariat and Militia Services	17,395,059	0	0			
Navy Services, including Transports and Packets	19,654,585	1	5			
Ordnance Services	10,411,543	13	2			
Vote of Credit (War with Russia)	4,200,000	0	0			
Miscellaneous Civil Services	6,930,912	17	5			
	58,592,100	12	0			
Revenue Departments, Votes issued .	4,104,505	6	4			
				62,696,605	18	4
				93,120,945	18	7 $\frac{3}{4}$

III.

DISPOSITION OF GRANTS.

An Account showing how the MONIES given for the SERVICE of the UNITED KINGDOM of GREAT BRITAIN and IRELAND for the Year 1855-56 have been disposed of, to 31st March, 1856.

SERVICES.	SUMS Voted or Granted.			SUMS Paid.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
ARMY	18,789,532	0	0	16,400,000	0	0
NAVY	19,379,013	0	0	19,050,000	0	0
ORDNANCE	8,644,142	0	0	8,582,559	13	2
Vote of Credit (War with Russia) . .	3,000,000	0	0	3,000,000	0	0
Civil Contingencies	100,000	0	0	
CLASS 1.—PUBLIC WORKS and BUILDINGS.						
Royal Palaces and Public Buildings . .	154,952	0	0	122,000	0	0
Royal Parks, Pleasure Gardens, &c. . .	69,544	0	0	55,000	0	0
New Houses of Parliament	122,209	0	0	102,000	0	0
General Repository for Public Records .	6,000	0	0	
Holyhead Harbour, &c.	122,841	0	0	105,230	13	7
Harbours of Refuge	234,000	0	0	96,000	0	0
Port Patrick Harbour	375	0	0	
Public Buildings, Ireland	30,963	0	0	15,276	0	0
Kingstown Harbour	5,876	0	0	3,630	0	0
CLASS 2.—SALARIES and EXPENSES of the PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS.						
Two Houses of Parliament, Salaries . .	82,140	0	0	30,000	0	0
Treasury	54,400	0	0	46,000	0	0
Home Department	27,595	0	0	20,000	0	0
Foreign Department	83,849	0	0	83,849	0	0
Colonial Department	35,897	0	0	26,000	0	0
Privy Council Office and Board of Trade .	75,733	0	0	63,000	0	0
Lord Privy Seal	2,700	0	0	2,700	0	0
Paymaster-General's Office	25,211	0	0	21,000	0	0
Exchequer	7,314	0	0	3,500	0	0
Office of Works, &c.	21,595	0	0	21,595	0	0
Office of Woods and Forests	21,862	0	0	21,862	0	0
Public Records and State Paper Office .	14,098	0	0	5,000	0	0
Poor Law Commission	205,383	0	0	56,300	0	0
Mint, including Coinage	38,222	0	0	38,222	0	0
Inspectors of Factories, &c.	15,530	0	0	12,000	0	0
Exchequer and Offices in Scotland . .	5,156	0	0	3,657	6	4
Household of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland .	6,431	0	0	3,195	0	9
Chief Secretary, Ireland	17,032	0	0	3,350	0	0
Paymaster of Civil Services, Ireland . .	6,889	0	0	6,248	9	1
Board of Public Works, Ireland	22,789	0	0	12,000	0	0

SERVICES— <i>continued</i> .	SUMS Voted or Granted.			SUMS Paid.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Audit Office	46,421	0	0	41,000	0	0
Copyhold Inclosure and Tithe Commission	16,270	0	0	16,270	0	0
Copyhold Imprest Expenses	12,190	0	0	12,190	0	0
General Register Office, England	42,500	0	0	37,000	0	0
General Register Office, Ireland	3,768	0	0	2,601	15	5
General Register Office, Scotland	5,715	0	0	5,715	0	0
National Debt Office	14,986	0	0	14,986	0	0
Public Works Loan Commission	3,260	0	0	3,260	0	0
West India Relief Commission	1,570	0	0	1,070	0	0
Commissioners in Lunacy, Contingent Expenses Office, Metropolitan Buildings	820	0	0	600	0	0
Superintendent of Roads, South Wales	3,000	0	0	3,000	0	0
Registrar of Friendly Societies	984	0	0	984	0	0
Secret Service	1,610	0	0	1,610	0	0
Printing and Stationery	32,000	0	0	21,353	16	0
	360,470	0	0	360,470	0	0

CLASS 3.—LAW and JUSTICE.

England :

Solicitor Treasury, and Law Charges	35,941	0	0	35,941	0	0
Prosecutions, formerly County Rates	250,000	0	0	90,000	0	0
Chancery, Crown Office	1,100	0	0	1,100	0	0
Queen's Bench, Crown Office	2,050	0	0	306	0	8
Exchequer, Queen's and Lord Treasurers' Remembrancer and Sheriffs' Expenses	15,900	0	0	1,000	0	0
Registrar of Admiralty Court	6,000	0	0	4,500	0	0
Insolvent Debtors' Court	8,415	0	0	4,525	0	0
County Courts, Treasurers' Salaries	13,850	0	0	11,500	0	0
Police Courts (Metropolis)	23,254	0	0	19,861	7	5
Metropolitan Police	101,218	0	0	70,187	10	3
Queen's Prison	4,226	0	0	3,011	17	3

Scotland :

Lord Advocate and Solicitor-General	3,342	0	0	3,342	0	0
Prosecutions (Lord Advocate)	7,755	0	0	
Court of Session, Salaries, &c.	17,526	0	0	17,526	0	0
Court of Justiciary, ditto	7,198	0	0	7,198	0	0
Exchequer (Legal Branch)	1,593	0	0	1,336	3	11
Sheriffs, &c., Criminal Prosecutions	57,000	0	0	
Procurators Fiscal, Salaries	11,530	0	0	11,530	0	0
Sheriffs' Clerks, Salaries	4,318	0	0	4,318	0	0
Expenses in matters of Tithes, &c.	2,250	0	0	100	0	0
General Register House, Edinburgh	11,166	0	0	11,166	0	0
Commissary Clerk, Edinburgh	1,119	0	0	1,119	0	0

Ireland:

Law Charges, Ireland	51,720	0	0	
Court of Chancery, Salaries and Expenses	1,294	0	0	1,294	0	0
Court of Queen's Bench ditto	1,338	0	0	1,043	1	0
Court of Common Pleas ditto	1,311	0	0	1,096	4	11
Court of Exchequer ditto	1,320	0	0	1,248	17	11
Taxing Officers of Law Courts ditto	200	0	0	200	0	0

SERVICES— <i>continued.</i>	SUMS Voted or Granted.			SUMS Paid.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Registrars to the Judges, Salaries . . .	5,232	0	0	5,232	0	0
Registrar of Judgments ditto . . .	1,906	0	0	1,729	0	0
High Court of Delegates, Fees to Advocates	300	0	0	199	10	0
Insolvent Debtors' Courts, Salaries and Ex- penses	3,146	0	0	2,814	2	3
Clerk of Court of Errors, Salary . . .	267	0	0	267	0	0
Police Justices, Dublin, Salaries . . .	1,600	0	0	1,600	0	0
Dublin Police	31,000	0	0	28,000	0	0
Constabulary Police, Ireland	638,511	0	0	618,345	4	3
Four Courts, Marshalsea, Salaries and Ex- penses	1,942	0	0	1,877	1	6
Prisons, Superintendence	18,770	0	0	17,147	13	4
Ditto, Establishments at Home	375,479	0	0	210,278	11	1
Ditto, Maintenance in County Gaols, &c. . .	166,174	0	0	25,850	0	0
Ditto, Transportation	59,405	0	0
Ditto, Convict Establishments, Colonies . .	297,621	0	0	161,682	11	0
CLASS 4.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE and ART.						
Education, Great Britain	396,921	0	0	355,000	0	0
Ditto Ireland	215,200	0	0	127,000	0	0
Commissioners of Education, Ireland, Office Expenses	605	0	0	605	0	0
Board of Trade, Science and Art	79,364	0	0	64,859	5	8
University of London	3,858	0	0
Universities, &c., in Scotland	7,952	0	0	3,796	9	10
Queen's University in Ireland	2,366	0	0	1,866	0	0
Queen's Colleges, Ireland	9,552	0	0	4,865	0	0
Royal Irish Academy	647	0	0	623	8	10
Royal Hibernian Academy	300	0	0	300	0	0
Belfast Theological Professors	2,600	0	0	1,815	15	11
British Museum Establishment	56,180	0	0	56,180	0	0
Ditto Buildings	27,520	0	0
Ditto Purchases	4,000	0	0	4,000	0	0
National Gallery	17,696	0	0	14,000	0	0
Scientific Works and Experiments	6,409	0	0	2,905	9	3
Royal Geographical Society	500	0	0	500	0	0
CLASS 5.—COLONIAL and CONSULAR SERVICES.						
Bermudas	4,050	0	0	2,549	0	0
Clergy, North America	7,397	0	0
Indian Department, Canada	7,010	0	0
Governors, West Indies, &c.	24,728	0	0	4,000	0	0
Justices ditto	24,750	0	0
Western Coast of Africa	10,630	0	0	1,500	0	0
St. Helena	11,057	0	0	8,500	0	0
Heligoland	976	0	0
Falkland Islands	2,807	0	0	2,707	0	0
Hong Kong	3,800	0	0
Emigration	16,720	0	0	5,000	0	0
Emigrants in Canada	10,500	0	0
Captured Negroes	10,000	0	0
Commissioners, Slave Trade Suppression .	11,250	0	0

SERVICES— <i>continued.</i>	SUMS Voted or Granted.			SUMS Paid.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Consuls Abroad	157,669	0	0	144,584	13	0
Ministers Abroad, Extraordinary Expenses .	25,000	0	0	25,000	0	0
CLASS 6.—SUPERANNUATIONS and CHARITIES.						
Superannuations, &c.	138,609	0	0	96,832	3	3
Toulonese and Corsican Emigrants . . .	2,270	0	0	
Vaccine Establishments	2,000	0	0	2,000	0	0
Refuge for the Destitute	325	0	0	
Polish Refugees and Distressed Spaniards .	4,200	0	0	3,000	0	0
Miscellaneous Charges, formerly Civil List .	4,371	0	0	2,000	0	0
Public Infirmaries, Ireland	2,985	0	0	2,985	0	0
Foundling Hospital, Dublin	1,295	0	0	
House of Industry ditto	11,790	0	0	6,731	0	0
Female Orphan House ditto	500	0	0	200	0	0
Westmoreland Lock Hospital, Dublin . . .	1,215	0	0	1,215	0	0
Lying-in Hospital ditto	500	0	0	500	0	0
Ditto, Steevens' Hospital ditto	795	0	0	795	0	0
Fever Hospital, Cork-street ditto	1,900	0	0	1,900	0	0
Hospital for Incurables	250	0	0	250	0	0
Dissenting Ministers, Ireland	38,953	0	0	36,649	2	0
Concordatum Fund ditto	6,384	0	0	5,409	17	4
CLASS 7.—SPECIAL and TEMPORARY OBJECTS.						
Board of Health	10,945	0	0	10,945	0	0
Ecclesiastical Commissioners	3,498	0	0	3,498	0	0
Charity Commissioners, England	12,390	0	0	12,390	0	0
Professors of Cambridge University	1,053	0	0	1,053	0	0
Patent Law Amendment Act	22,572	0	0	11,357	0	0
Statute Law Commissioners	3,711	0	0	1,000	0	0
Incumbered Estates Commission, Ireland . .	15,480	0	0	15,409	7	9
Brehon Laws Commissioners, Ireland . . .	900	0	0	500	0	0
Process Servers, Ireland	9,000	0	0	4,152	0	0
Joint Stock Company Registration	2,270	0	0	
Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions	69,115	0	0	33,000	0	0
Battersea Park	25,500	0	0	20,000	0	0
Chelsea Embankment	25,000	0	0	
Lighthouses, Abroad	10,700	0	0	
Cholera, West Indies	1,811	0	0	1,811	0	0
Agricultural Statistics	10,300	0	0	4,500	0	0
Fishery Board, Scotland	14,000	0	0	10,575	6	2
Trustees of Manufactures, Scotland	2,000	0	0	2,000	0	0
Commissioners of Highland Roads and Bridges	5,000	0	0	5,000	0	0
Bounties on Slaves	12,000	0	0	4,000	0	0
Dues under Treaties of Reciprocity	68,500	0	0	33,161	15	3
Revising Barristers, England and Wales . .	17,850	0	0	17,850	0	0
Inspectors of Corn Returns (Salaries) . . .	3,800	0	0	2,271	12	11
Quarantine Expenses	3,600	0	0	3,600	0	0
British Consulate Buildings, Constantinople .	5,752	0	0	
British Embassy House, Constantinople . .	4,578	0	0	4,578	0	0
Building Courts of Law, Isle of Man . . .	1,550	0	0	
Public Records Repository (Iron Doors) . .	9,000	0	0	
Downing-street Buildings	40,000	0	0	11,000	0	0

SERVICES— <i>continued.</i>	SUMS Voted or Granted.			SUMS Paid.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Brought forward . . .						
Census Expenses, Ireland	9,000	0	0	9,000	0	0
Army and Navy Medals	52,500	0	0	52,500	0	0
United States Claimants	68,131	0	0	56,000	0	0
Townley's Escheat	54,218	0	0	54,218	0	0
British Seamen Abroad, Relief	17,000	0	0	4,000	0	0
National Gallery, Ireland	3,000	0	0	
Metropolis Interment Acts	9,927	0	0	9,927	0	0
Galleries of Art, Edinburgh	5,000	0	0	5,000	0	0
Cape of Good Hope, Employment of Native Tribes	40,000	0	0	20,000	0	0
Pall Mall to Green Park Continuation	5,800	0	0	
Inverness Bridge	3,000	0	0	3,000	0	0
Buckingham House, Pall Mall	11,000	0	0	11,000	0	0
Windsor Improvements	3,718	0	0	3,718	0	0
Arctic Discoveries (Rewards)	10,000	0	0	10,000	0	0
Monument to Sir John Franklin	800	0	0	400	0	0
Compensation to Dr. S. Smith	300	0	0	300	0	0
Museum at Kensington Gore	15,000	0	0	4,000	0	0
Army, Navy, &c . . . £49,812,687 }	56,318,749	0	0	51,362,097	18	3
Civil Services . . . 6,506,062 }						
REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.						
Customs . . . Salaries, &c., Vote 1 . .	835,182	0	0	604,485	11	11
Ditto . . . Coast Guard, Vote 2 . .	483,238	0	0	337,929	4	9
Inland Revenue . . Salaries, &c., Vote 3 . .	1,365,950	0	0	903,814	6	10
Ditto . . . Revenue Police, Vote 4 . .	62,720	0	0	44,994	18	0
Post Office . . . Salaries, &c., Vote 5 . .	1,638,861	0	0	1,169,723	5	1
	60,704,700	0	0	54,423,045	4	10
PAYMENTS for SERVICES not voted, but charged on the Supplies granted for the Service of the Year 1855-56 :						
Interest on Exchequer Bills (Supply)		616,083	7	5
Office for Building additional Churches		3,000	0	0
Principal of Exchequer Bills paid off in Money, less 500,000 <i>l.</i> re-issued for Supply Services		26,500	0	0
	60,704,700	0	0	55,068,628	12	3
	SUPPLEMENTAL SUPPLIES Voted for the Years 1854-55 and 1855-56.			ISSUED to the 31st March, 1856.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
SUPPLEMENTAL SUPPLIES of 1854-55 and 1855-56, voted in February, 1856.						
Navy, " Excess " 1854-55	204,982	1	5	204,982	1	5
Ordnance, Excess 1855-56	1,346,023	0	0	1,346,023	0	0
Army and Navy Medals 1855-56	80,000	0	0	
	1,631,005	1	5	1,551,005	1	5

WAYS AND MEANS

GRANTED FOR THE SERVICE OF THE YEAR 1855-56.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Grant, per Act 18 Vict. c. 5	3,300,000	0	0			
Issued on account of Supplemental Votes for 1854-55	2,720,000	0	0			
Balance on 31st March, 1855				580,000	0	0
Per Act 18 Vict. c. 6				20,000,000	0	0
„ 18 & 19 Vict. c. 37				10,000,000	0	0
„ 18 & 19 Vict. c. 129 (Appropriation Act)				26,006,352	12	9
„ 18 & 19 Vict. c. 129, Surplus of Ways and Means of prior years				5,599,112	6	8
				62,185,464	19	5
Issued on account of Votes in year to 31st March, 1856	£ 55,305,609	4	10			
Ditto, Interest of Exchequer Bills	616,083	7	5			
Ditto, Building additional Churches	3,000	0	0			
Principal of Exchequer Bills paid off in Money . £526,500						
Less, amount re-issued . £500,000						
Net Amount paid off out of Ways and Means, 1855-56	26,500	0	0			
				55,951,192	12	3
				6,234,272	7	2
Balance of Ways and Means on 31st March, 1856, to defray the Supplies granted previously to that date				6,760,609	14	4
Balance of Supplies outstanding on 31st March, 1856				6,198,581	1	4
Surplus of Ways and Means of 1853-54 £77,653 16s. 8d. }						
Ditto of 1854-55 £245,192 14s. 8d. }				562,028	13	0
Ditto of 1855-56 £239,182 1s. 8d. }						

SUPPLEMENTAL WAYS AND MEANS.

MONEY GRANTS.

	£	s.	d.
Granted per Act 19 Vict. c. 4	1,631,005	1	5
Issued on Account of Supplemental Votes for 1854-55 and 1855-56	1,551,005	1	5
Balance on 31st March, 1856	80,000	0	0

WAYS AND MEANS.

EXCHEQUER BILL GRANTS.

	£	s.	d.
Vote for the Year 1855, per Act 18 Vict. c. 13, to pay off Bills issued under Act 17 Vict. c. 12, and prior Acts	17,183,000	0	0

IV.—PUBLIC

AN ACCOUNT of the State of the PUBLIC FUNDED DEBT of GREAT
March, 1856.

DEBT.

	CAPITALS.	CAPITALS Transferred to and standing in the Names of the Commissioners.	CAPITALS UNREDEEMED.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
GREAT BRITAIN.			
New Annuities at 2½ per cent. . .	3,032,932 2 0	31,186 0 5	3,001,746 1 7
Debt due to Bank of England at 3 per cent.	11,015,100 0 0	11,015,100 0 0
Consolidated Annuities ditto. . .	392,178,361 18 1	1,547,359 0 0	390,631,502 18 1
Reduced Annuities . ditto. . .	115,220,742 7 9	1,659,499 11 6	113,561,242 16 3
New Annuities . . ditto. . .	214,433,265 11 4	445,627 1 6	213,987,638 9 10
Total, at 3 per cent. . . .	732,847,969 17 2	3,652,485 13 0	729,195,484 4 2
New Annuities at 3½ per cent. . .	240,746 6 4	240,746 6 4
New Annuities at 5 per cent. . . .	431,749 14 4	624 15 0	431,124 19 4
Total, Great Britain	736,553,397 19 10	3,684,296 8 5	732,869,101 11 5
IRELAND.			
New Annuities at 2½ per cent. . .	6,029 15 7	6,029 15 7
Consolidated Annuities at 3 per cent.	6,566,317 7 4	6,566,317 7 4
Reduced Annuities ditto. . .	140,983 7 5	140,983 7 5
New Annuities . . ditto. . .	33,097,493 12 9	33,097,493 12 9
Debt due to Bank of Ireland at 3½ per cent.	2,630,769 4 8	2,630,769 4 8
New Annuities at 5 per cent. . . .	2,000 0 0	2,000 0 0
Total, Ireland	42,443,593 7 9	42,443,593 7 9
Total, United Kingdom, at 31st March, 1856	778,996,991 7 7	3,684,296 8 5	775,312,694 19 2

ABSTRACT.

* * * Shillings and Pence omitted.

	CAPITALS.	CAPITALS transferred to the Commis- sioners.	CAPITALS unredeemed.	ANNUAL CHARGE.		
				Due to the Public Creditor.	Manage- ment.	TOTAL.
Great Britain	£ 736,553,397	£ 3,684,296	£ 732,869,101	£ 25,774,087	£ 95,875	£ 25,869,963
Ireland . . .	42,443,593	..	42,443,593	1,489,340	..	1,489,340
Total, United Kingdom, on 31st March, 1856	778,996,991	3,684,296*	775,312,694	27,263,428	95,875	27,359,303

DEFERRED ANNUITIES outstanding on 31st March, 1856.

Deferred Life Annuities, per 10 Geo. 4, c. 24; 3 Will. 4, c. 14; and 16 & 17 Vict. c. 45	£28,027 11 6
Deferred Annuities for terms of Years per ditto	660 9 6
	£28,688 1 0

* On account of Donations and Requests	£678,643 13 2
Ditto of Stock unclaimed 10 years and upwards	706,077 17 1
Ditto of Unclaimed Dividends	2,299,574 18 2
	£3,684,296 8 5

FUNDED DEBT.

BRITAIN and IRELAND, and the Charge thereupon, at the 31st

CHARGE.

		IN GREAT BRITAIN.	IN IRELAND.	TOTAL ANNUAL CHARGE of Unredeemed Debt.
		£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Due to the Public Creditor.	Annual Interest of Unredeemed Debt	21,930,890 10 11	1,286,471 9 10 $\frac{3}{4}$	
	Long Annuities, expire 5th Jan. 1860	1,157,084 11 7	135,346 15 0	
	Annuities per 4 Geo. 4, c. 22, expire 5th April, 1867	585,740 0 0	
	Annuities per 18 Viet. c. 18, expire 5th April, 1885	116,000 0 0	
	Annuities for a limited term of years, per 59 Geo. 3, c. 34, 10 Geo. 4, c. 24, and 3 Will. 4, c. 14, expire at various periods; viz. :—			
	Granted up to 31 March, 1856 £1,736,583 0 0			
	Deduct, Expired and Unclaimed up to ditto, including £106,100 Waterloo Annuities, 59 Geo. 3, c. 34. 812,924 16 7			
	£923,658 3 5	861,658 3 5	62,000 0 0	
	Life Annuities, per 48 Geo. 3, c. 142, 10 Geo. 4, c. 24, 3 Will. 4, c. 14, and 16 & 17 Vict. c. 45; viz. :—			
	Granted up to 31 Mar. 1856 . . £2,773,911 15 0			
Payable at the National Debt Office.	Deduct, Expired and Unclaimed up to 31 March, 1856 . . 1,742,769 14 6			
	Tontine and other Life Annuities, per various Acts } English	1,031,122 0 6	
		15,507 4 1	
		26,084 19 9	5,522 13 11	
Management		25,774,087 10 3	1,489,340 18 9 $\frac{3}{4}$	
		95,875 9 9	
Total Annual Charge, exclusive of £113,844 2s. 4d., the Annual Charge on Capitals and Long Annuities, and Annuities for Terms of Years, per 10 Geo. 4, c. 24, standing in the names of the Commissioners on account of Stock Unclaimed 10 Years and upwards, and of Unclaimed Dividends, and also on account of Donations and Bequests		25,869,963 0 0	1,489,340 18 9 $\frac{3}{4}$	27,359,303 18 9 $\frac{3}{4}$

The Act 10 Geo. 4, c. 27, which came into operation at the 5th July, 1829, enacts, "That the Sum thenceforth annually applicable to the Reduction of the National Debt of the United Kingdom, shall be the sum which shall appear to be the Amount of the whole actual annual surplus Revenue, beyond the Expenditure of the said United Kingdom;" and the following Sums have been accordingly received by the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, including Sums on account of Donations and Bequests, viz. :—

	On account of The Sinking Fund.	On account of Donations and Bequests.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Applicable between		
31st March and 30th June, 1855	nil.	2,771 5 2
30th June and 30th September, 1855	*6,906 14 7	7,116 17 5
30th September and 31st December, 1855	nil.	2,771 5 2
31st December, 1855, and 31st March, 1856	nil.	7,233 17 3
	6,906 14 7	19,893 5 0

V.--UNFUNDED DEBT.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE UNFUNDED DEBT OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, AND OF THE DEMANDS OUTSTANDING ON THE 31ST MARCH, 1856.

AN ACCOUNT of the UNFUNDED DEBT in EXCHEQUER BILLS and EXCHEQUER BONDS on the 31st March, 1855; the Amount issued in the Year ended 31st March, 1856; the Amount issued for paying off Exchequer Bills within the same Period, and the Amount outstanding on 31st March, 1856; distinguishing, also, the Total Amount unprovided for, together with the Amount of Interest upon the Outstanding Exchequer Bills computed to the latter Day.

	Exchequer Bills.			Exchequer Bonds of 1855.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Unfunded Debt on 31st March, 1855 .	17,151,400	0	0	6,000,000	0	0
Amount issued in the Year ended 31st March 1856	22,430,700	0	0	1,000,000	0	0
	39,582,100	0	0	7,000,000	0	0
Amount paid off within the same period .	18,399,400	0	0	
Total Amount outstanding on 31st March, 1856	21,182,700	0	0	7,000,000	0	0
Amount of Interest upon the same . .	805,303	18	1	245,000	0	0

AN ACCOUNT of EXCHEQUER BILLS (Deficiency) issued in the Year ended 31st March, 1856, to meet the Charge on the CONSOLIDATED FUND, and the Sum which will be required to meet the Charge on that Day.

Issued to meet the Charge :	£	s.	d.
For the Quarter ended 31st March, 1855, and paid off before 30th June, 1855	3,467,094	4	6
For the Quarter ended 30th June, 1855, and paid off before 30th September, 1855	3,306,433	8	4
For the Quarter ended 30th September, 1855, and paid off before 31st December, 1855	853,412	16	5
For the Quarter ended 31st December, 1855, and paid off before 31st March, 1856	3,879,749	12	11
To be issued to meet the Charge for the Quarter ended 31st March, 1856, in the Quarter to 30th June, 1856	2,569,109	4	4

VI.—TRADE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

AN Account of the VALUE of the IMPORTS into, and of the EXPORTS from, the UNITED KINGDOM of GREAT BRITAIN and IRELAND, during each of the three Years 1853, 1854 and 1855; calculated at the Official Rates of Valuation, and distinguishing the Amount of the Produce and Manufactures of the United Kingdom Exported, from the Value of Foreign and Colonial Merchandise Exported:—Also, stating the Amount of the Produce and Manufactures of the United Kingdom Exported therefrom, according to the Real or Declared Value thereof; showing the Trade of Great Britain and Ireland separately and jointly.

YEARS.	GREAT BRITAIN.				IRELAND.				UNITED KINGDOM.				
	VALUE of Imports into Great Britain.	VALUE OF EXPORTS FROM GREAT BRITAIN.			VALUE of the Produce and Manufactures of the United Kingdom Exported from Great Britain.	VALUE OF EXPORTS FROM IRELAND.			VALUE of the Produce and Manufactures of the United Kingdom Exported from Ireland.	VALUE OF EXPORTS FROM THE UNITED KINGDOM.			VALUE of the Produce and Manufactures of the United Kingdom Exported therefrom.
		Produce and Manufactures of the United Kingdom.	Foreign and Colonial Merchandise.	Total Exports.		Produce and Manufactures of the United Kingdom.	Foreign and Colonial Merchandise.	Total Exports.		Produce and Manufactures of the United Kingdom.	Foreign and Colonial Merchandise.	Total Exports.	
1853	117,193,754	214,117,731	27,739,444	241,957,175	98,709,688	£	£	£	123,099,313	214,327,452	27,744,774	242,072,226	98,933,781
1854	120,940,944	213,899,691	29,814,866	243,714,557	96,912,041	£	£	£	124,426,159	214,071,848	29,820,656	243,892,504	97,184,726
1855	113,876,186	226,680,594	31,499,690	258,180,284	95,346,433	£	£	£	117,399,362	226,909,012	31,504,132	258,413,144	95,688,089

NAVIGATION OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

NEW VESSELS BUILT.—AN ACCOUNT of the Number of VESSELS, with the Amount of their TONNAGE, that were Built and Registered in the several Ports of the BRITISH EMPIRE, in the Years ending 5th January, 1854, 1855, and 31st December, 1855, respectively.

	Year ending 5th January, 1854.			Year ending 5th January, 1855.			Year ending 31st December, 1855.		
	Vessels.	Tonnage.		Vessels.	Tonnage.		Vessels.	Tonnage.	
England	611	150,150		581	134,301		866	252,832	
Scotland	163	50,326		168	53,129		190	60,245	
Ireland	24	2,695		53	9,512		42	10,123	
Isles of Guernsey, Jersey, and Man .	32	4,067		28	4,761		28	3,894	
British Plantations	723	152,550		752	188,272		603	145,323	
TOTAL	1,553	359,788		1,582	389,975		1,729	472,417	

VESELS REGISTERED.—AN ACCOUNT of the Number of VESSELS, with the Amount of their TONNAGE, and the Number of MEN and Boys usually employed in Navigating the same, that belonged to the several Ports of the BRITISH EMPIRE, on the 31st December, 1853, 1854, and 1855 respectively.

	On the 31st December, 1853.			On the 31st December, 1854.			On the 31st December, 1855.		
	Vessels.	Tonnage.	Men.	Vessels.	Tonnage.	Men.	Vessels.	Tonnage.	Men.
England	20,078	3,150,653	152,184	20,336	3,365,330	162,423	19,606	3,449,844	155,295
Scotland	3,451	559,141	29,563	3,393	556,978	29,035	3,326	583,293	27,403
Ireland	2,219	259,364	14,083	2,257	262,377	13,262	2,183	253,771	13,430
Isles of Guernsey, Jersey, and Man .	860	61,046	5,701	873	64,065	5,911	833	62,426	4,371
British Plantations	8,701	734,218	52,365	9,489	867,096	58,462	9,557	876,552	58,870
TOTAL	35,309	4,764,422	253,896	36,348	5,115,846	269,093	35,505	5,225,886	259,369

Note.—The Account rendered for the Plantations for the Year ending 31st December 1854, is now corrected; and, as several Returns for that part of the Empire are not yet received for the last Year, a similar correction will be necessary when the next Account is made up.
In consequence of a Revision of the Registry of the United Kingdom and Channel Islands, commenced last Year, 1,245 Vessels have been struck off as “Lost,” “Broken up,” “Sold to Foreigners,” &c., prior to 1855, thereby making a diminution of 127,265 tons, in addition to the Casualties of the Year.

VESSELS EMPLOYED IN THE FOREIGN TRADE.

AN ACCOUNT of the Number of VESSELS, with the Amount of their TONNAGE (including their repeated Voyages), that entered Inwards and cleared Outwards at the several Ports of the UNITED KINGDOM from and to Foreign Ports, during each of the Three Years ending the 5th of January, 1854 and 1855, and 31st of December, 1855.

SHIPPING ENTERED INWARDS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM, FROM FOREIGN PORTS.												
YEARS ending 5th Jan.	GREAT BRITAIN.				IRELAND.				UNITED KINGDOM.			
	British and Irish Vessels.		Foreign Vessels.		British and Irish Vessels.		Foreign Vessels.		British and Irish Vessels.		Foreign Vessels.	
	Vessels.	Tons.	Vessels.	Tons.	Vessels.	Tons.	Vessels.	Tons.	Vessels.	Tons.	Tons.	
	1854	20,467	4,819,747	20,053	3,650,264	1,161	235,596	1,195	237,499	21,628	5,055,343	21,248
1855	20,460	5,163,423	19,630	3,668,838	880	211,128	621	117,977	21,340	5,374,551	20,251	3,786,815
1855	21,971	5,096,247	17,621	3,566,081	816	174,545	572	114,366	22,787	5,270,792	18,193	3,680,447
SHIPPING CLEARED OUTWARDS FROM THE UNITED KINGDOM TO FOREIGN PORTS.												
YEARS ending 5th Jan.	GREAT BRITAIN.				IRELAND.				UNITED KINGDOM.			
	British and Irish Vessels.		Foreign Vessels.		British and Irish Vessels.		Foreign Vessels.		British and Irish Vessels.		Foreign Vessels.	
	Vessels.	Tons.	Vessels.	Tons.	Vessels.	Tons.	Vessels.	Tons.	Vessels.	Tons.	Tons.	
	1854	20,937	5,068,610	22,287	4,015,019	541	144,370	1,014	219,105	21,478	5,212,980	23,301
1855	20,491	5,249,173	22,177	4,051,272	385	121,125	441	86,151	20,876	5,370,298	22,618	4,137,423
1855	22,764	5,562,881	19,355	3,858,899	331	86,059	147	30,392	23,095	5,648,940	19,502	3,889,291

INDIAN REVENUES.

GENERAL ABSTRACT ACCOUNT of the RECEIPTS and DISBURSEMENTS of the several PRESIDENCIES of INDIA, for the Year ended the 30th April, 1855, showing the Local Surplus or Deficit at each Presidency.

NET REVENUES AND RECEIPTS.		BENGAL.	NORTH WESTERN PROVINCES, including the Annexed Territory.	TOTAL.	MADRAS.	BOMBAY, including SIND and SATTARA.	TOTAL of INDIA.
		£	£	£	£	£	£
Per Account		8,331,718	5,714,588
Ditto	
Ditto		3,339,000
Ditto		2,981,274	..
Total Net Receipts		8,331,718	5,714,588	14,046,306	3,339,000	2,981,274	20,366,580
EXPENDITURE.							
Charges of the Civil and Political Establishments of India, including Contingent Charges		1,122,975	375,941	1,498,916	378,456	425,057	2,302,429
Judicial and Police Charges		774,698	482,258	1,656,956	332,861	383,234	2,373,051
Buildings, Roads and other Public Works, exclusive of Repairs and of Military Buildings		281,244	582,581	863,825	383,750	80,543	1,328,118
Military Charges		* 5,223,780	206,689	5,824,386	{ 2,563,389	1,702,550	10,192,268
Military Buildings		370,269	23,648	307,592	44,565	52,378	536,507
Indian Navy and Marine Charges		307,592	..	63,667	14,801	214,114	63,667
Charges of Prince of Wales' Island, Singapore and Malacca		63,667	..	308,791	308,791
Charges of the Nagpore Territory		308,791	..	24,115	11,074	13,519	48,708
Mint Charges		24,115	..	165,754	65,436	77,215	308,405
Interest on Debt (exclusive of Interest on the General Registered Debt of India)		154,763	10,991
Local Deficit at Bengal		8,631,894	2,082,108	10,714,002	3,799,332	2,948,610	17,461,944
Interest on the General Registered Debt of India, charged in Account to Bengal		300,176	..	1,600,265	1,600,265
Total Expenditure		1,600,265	..	12,314,267	3,799,332	2,948,610	19,062,209
Local Deficit: after charging to Bengal the Interest on the General Registered Debt of India		10,232,159	2,082,108	1,732,039	460,332	..	Net Local Surplus,
Local Surplus		1,900,441	3,632,480	14,046,306	..	32,664	1,304,371
		20,366,580
		8,331,718	5,714,588	..	3,339,000	2,981,274	..

* Partly chargeable to the North Western Provinces.
Charges defrayed in England £3,011,735
Local Surplus brought down 1,304,371
Excess of Expenditure over Income £1,707,364

AVERAGE PRICES OF BRITISH CORN.

FROM THE RETURNS.

	Wheat.		Barley.		Oats.		Rye.		Beans.		Peas.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
January	76	1	37	8	26	7	53	4	46	0	44	9
February	71	7	37	2	23	10	50	4	42	7	41	6
March	67	11	36	3	23	2	43	2	41	0	40	3
April	69	0	39	2	23	7	44	7	41	9	37	4
May.....	68	9	40	0	23	5	41	4	41	7	39	11
June	68	3	39	4	23	11	44	3	42	1	39	7
July.....	71	6	38	11	25	0	47	1	43	9	41	10
August.....	57	4	41	7	26	6	48	3	45	3	42	8
September	71	6	45	1	26	11	44	2	45	2	40	5
October	64	10	44	11	26	5	42	11	45	4	42	4
November	65	5	45	4	26	5	40	9	46	4	44	5
December	61	10	44	8	25	1	40	10	44	11	42	3

AVERAGE PRICES OF HAY, STRAW, & CLOVER, P LOAD.

	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	April.	May.	June.	July.	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
	s.	s.	s.	s.	s.	s.	s.	s.	s.	s.	s.	s.
Hay . { from	75	80	80	80	80	80	112	90	80	68	68	68
	to 112	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	90	80	80	72
Straw { from	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	28	28	26	24	24
	to 28	28	28	28	28	28	28	32	32	30	28	28
Clover { from	90	90	90	85	85	125	125	100	100	70	70	70
	to 130	125	135	130	130	130	130	120	126	110	110	100

AVERAGE PRICES OF BUTCHER'S MEAT.

Average Prices per Stone of 8 lbs. in Smithfield Market, in 1856.

	Beef.				Mutton.				Veal,				Pork.							
	s.	d.		s.	d.	s.	d.		s.	d.		s.	d.	s.	d.		s.	d.		
January ...	2	10	to	4	6	2	10	to	4	8	4	8	to	6	0	3	8	to	5	0
February...	3	4	...	5	0	3	2	...	5	0	4	6	...	6	0	3	8	...	4	10
March	3	4	...	4	10	3	6	...	5	2	4	6	...	6	0	3	8	...	4	10
April	3	2	...	4	8	4	0	...	5	8	4	2	...	5	8	4	4	...	4	8
May.....	3	0	...	4	6	3	6	...	5	0	4	0	...	5	6	3	2	...	4	8
June	4	0	...	5	0	4	2	...	5	2	4	8	...	5	4	4	0	...	4	10
July.....	4	4	...	5	0	4	4	...	5	2	4	4	...	5	2	4	2	...	5	0
August	3	10	...	4	10	4	4	...	5	2	3	8	...	5	0	4	2	...	5	0
September.	3	10	...	4	10	4	0	...	5	0	4	2	...	5	2	3	10	...	4	10
October....	3	4	...	4	10	4	2	...	5	2	3	10	...	4	10	4	0	...	5	0
November .	4	0	...	5	2	4	0	...	5	2	5	0	...	5	4	3	8	...	4	6
December .	3	6	...	5	2	4	4	...	5	6	4	4	...	5	4	4	2	...	5	2

SUMMARY of the DEATHS, BIRTHS, and MARRIAGES, in ENGLAND and WALES, and of the DEATHS and BIRTHS in the METROPOLIS, in the Year 1856.—*Compiled from Tables published by Authority of the Registrar-General.*

ENGLAND AND WALES.						THE METROPOLIS.				
Population, Census, 1841, 15,914,148; 1851, 17,927,609. 1856 (estimated), 19,045,000.						Census, 1841, 1,943,369; 1851, 2,373,799. 1856 (estimated), 2,616,248.				
Total DEATHS, Eng. and Wales.		Mort. per cent.	Total BIRTHS, Eng. and Wales.		Total MAR- RIAGES.	Districts.	DEATHS in Year.	Mort. per cent.	In Quarters.	Deaths.
				per cent.						
Winter ..	103,208	2·186	169,252	3·585	33,388	West....	8,952	2·097	Winter..	14,533
Spring ..	100,310	2·117	173,204	3·655	38,796	North ..	11,610	2·069	Spring ..	14,069
Summer ..	91,330	1·899	157,633	3·278	39,152	Central..	8,815	2·193	Summer ..	14,066
Autumn ..	96,521	2·001	157,615	3·267	47,926	East	12,269	2·286	Autumn ..	14,118
	Av.	2·055	Av.	3·454	Av. 839	South ..	15,140	2·211		
							Av.	2·178		
Males ..	199,571		Males ..	335,871					DEATHS	BIRTHS
Females	191,798		Females	321,833					28,894	44,159
									Females	27,892
										42,674
Total ..	391,369	657,704	159,262				Total ..	56,786
										86,833

MARRIAGES, BIRTHS, and DEATHS, returned in the Years 1847–1856.

Years.	1847.	1848.	1849.	1850.	1851.	1852.	1853.	1854.	1855.	1856.
Marriages	135,845	138,230	141,883	152,744	154,206	158,782	164,520	159,727	152,113	159,262
Births	539,965	563,059	578,159	593,422	615,865	624,012	612,391	634,405	635,043	657,704
Deaths	423,304	399,833	440,839	368,995	395,396	407,135	421,097	437,905	425,703	391,369

METEOROLOGICAL TABLE FOR 1856.—*From Observations at Greenwich by the Astronomer Royal.*

Quarters.	Barom.	Thermometer.						Wind.	Rain.	
	Mean.	Highest.	Lowest.	Highest in the sun.	Lowest on the grass.	Mean temper. of the air.	Difference from av. of 15 yrs.	Daily Horizontal movement. Miles.	In inches.	Diff. from average.
Winter ..	29·793	58·0	24·3	75·5	8·0	40·0	+0·2	108	4·8	—0·3
Spring ..	29·713	83·1	29·8	105·4	16·0	50·5	—1·0	119	7·4	+1·6
Summer ..	29·743	89·8	40·0	111·2	29·0	59·9	—0·1	77	5·8	—1·2
Autumn ..	29·846	66·0	19·4	82·8	9·5	44·2	—0·4	94	3·9	—3·7
YEAR....	29·774	89·8	19·4	111·2	8·0	48·6	+0·7	100	21·9	—3·6

Total Number of BANKRUPTS.

1855.	England.	Scotland.	Ireland.	Total.
January	115	29	5	149
February	106	34	1	141
March	89	27	4	120
April	113	25	5	143
May	92	26	6	124
June	81	14	7	102
July	93	26	4	123
August	96	23	7	126
September	86	19	4	109
October	100	26	5	131
November	104	41	6	151
December	118	47	5	170
Total	1193	337	59	1589

UNIVERSITY HONOURS.

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

EXAMINATIONS. TERM,—PASCHAL, 1856.

IN LITERIS HUMANIORIBUS.

CLASSIS I.

Arnold, Charles T. *Corpus Christi*.
Bramley, Henry R. *University*.
Halcomb, Thomas R. *Brasenose*.
Henniker, Robert. *Trinity*.
Smith, Albert. *Lincoln*.
Thackeray, Francis St. J. *Merton*.

CLASSIS II.

Browne, John C. *Corpus Christi*.
Bulkley, Edward. *Lincoln*.
Cattlow, James. *St. John's*.
Clayton, Nathaniel G. *University*.
Curteis, Arthur M. *Trinity*.
Hanbury, John C. *Wadham*.
Harpur, Henry W. *Merton*.
Jones, William E. *Jesus*.
Longley, Henry. *Christ Church*.
Monkhouse, John. *Queen's*.
Newnham, William H. *Balliol*.
Rawdon, William F. *Wadham*.
Saunders, Herbert C. *Christ Church*.
Tanner, Joseph. *Magdalen*.
Warren, Hon. John. *Christ Church*.
Wickham, Edward C. *New College*.

CLASSIS III.

Clarke, William F. *Christ Church*.
Evered, John J. G. *Magdalen*.
Gauntlett, John G. *Worcester*.
Hall, William E. *University*.
Harris, George C. *Exeter*.
Hichens, Thomas S. *Exeter*.

Lascellies, Edwin A. *Balliol*.
Master, Streynsham M. *Balliol*.
Mosely, William H. *Balliol*.
Sewell, Capel J. *Brasenose*.
Shepherd, William B. *Queen's*.
Somerset, Boscawen T. G. *Oriel*.
Stratton, William. *New College*.
Thorold, Edmund. *Magdalen*.
Wilberforce, William F. *University*.

CLASSIS IV.

Bateman, Edward L. *University*.
Berkeley, Sackville H. *Oriel*.
Cleaver, William H. *Christ Church*.
Colquhoun, John E. C. *Trinity*.
Davies, George J. *Worcester*.
Drabble, Peter B. *Worcester*.
Dundas, Robert J. *Exeter*.
Evans, William H. *Jesus*.
Gildea, William. *Exeter*.
Joy, Samuel. *Worcester*.
Lonsdale, Arthur P. *Balliol*.
Milligan, William. *University*.
Rendell, Stuart. *Oriel*.

CLASSIS V.

One Hundred and Twenty-nine.

Examiners.

W. E. Jelf.
W. Hedley.
F. Meyrick.
A. S. Farrar.

IN SCIENTIIS MATHEMATICIS ET PHYSICIS.

CLASSIS I.

Davey, Horace. *University*.
Wheeler, T. L. *Worcester*.

CLASSIS II.

Bowden, James. *University*.
Thomas, T. *Jesus*.

CLASSIS III.

Gauntlett, J. G. *Worcester*.
Hamerton, S. C. *University*.
Jackson, A. W. *Worcester*.

CLASSIS IV.

Halcomb, Thomas R. *Brasenose*.
Monkhouse, John. *Queen's*.
Newnham, W. H. *Balliol*.
Smith, Albert. *Lincoln*.
Smith, William R. *Pembroke*.
Warrand, Rob. H. M. *Trinity*.

CLASSIS V.

Fifty-six.

Examiners.

R. Walker.
W. Spottiswoode.
F. Ashpitel.

IN SCIENTIA NATURALI.

CLASSIS I.

Tuckwell, Henry M. *Lincoln.*

CLASSIS II.

Swayne, W. J. *Corpus.*Thornton, Samuel. *Queen's.*Wright, Henry. *Balliol.*

CLASSIS III.

Jackson, Abraham W. *Worcester.*

CLASSIS IV.

CLASSIS V.

Three.

Examiners.

N. Story-Maskelyne.

J. Phillips.

H. J. S. Smith.

IN JURISPRUDENTIA ET HISTORIA MODERNA.

CLASSIS I.

Blaauw, Henry G. G. *Christ Church.*Bosanquet, C. *Oriel.*Trefusis, Hon. C. H. R. *Christ Church.*

CLASSIS II.

Bartrum, E. *Pembroke.*Bramston, W. L. *Balliol.*Daniell, E. F. *Christ Church.*Hawkins, E. *Balliol.*Livingston, W. *Worcester.*Templeman, E. *Pembroke.*

CLASSIS III.

Colquhoun, J. E. C. *Trinity.*Culley, M. I. *University.*Cure, L. G. C. *Balliol.*Fazakerley, J. N. *University.*Wilberforce, W. F. *University.*

CLASSIS IV.

Hodge, W. H. O. B. *Magdalen.*Miller, G. *Exeter.*Nicholson, W. S. *Christ Church.*Sterry, F. *Exeter.*

CLASSIS V.

Forty-six.

Examiners.

E. H. Hansell.

H. G. Cripps.

G. Marshall.

EXAMINATIONS. TERM,—MICHAELMAS, 1856.

IN LITERIS HUMANIORIBUS.

CLASSIS I.

Burrows, M. *Magdalen.*Ellis, R. *Balliol.*Sidgwick, W. *Corpus.*Wallace-Hozier, T. *Balliol.*

CLASSIS II.

Abbey, C. J. *Lincoln.*Harrington, Richard. *Christ Church.*Hole, C. H. *Worcester.*Howell, Arthur P. *St. John's.*Joyce, S. *Christ Church.*Marshall, S. *Exeter.*Stebbling, T. R. R. *Worcester.*Walter-Merry, W. *Balliol.*Watkins, M. G. *Exeter.*

CLASSIS III.

Alabaster, C. *Lincoln.*Blair, A. *Exeter.*Dixon, R. G. *Pembroke.*Edwards, W. T. *Jesus.*Ellaby, E. R. *Wadham.*Fisher, A. B. *Corpus.*

Hiley, W. *Wadham*.
 Jelf, G. E. *Christ Church*.
 McCheane, Jas. H. *Lincoln*.
 Moens, Seaborne, M.B. *Merton*.
 Nihill, H. D. *Jesus*.
 Pearse, V. *Lincoln*.
 Price, J. V. *Pembroke*.
 Thomas, D. R. *Jesus*.
 Warre, F. *Balliol*.
 Wilder, H. B. *Balliol*.
 Woodrooffe, H. R. *Christ Church*.

CLASSIS IV.

Arnold, W. *Pembroke*.
 Charley, W. T. *St. John's*.

Hodgson, W. *Exeter*.
 Lyon, J. *Trinity*.
 Palk, A. *University*.
 Pottinger, H. *Merton*.
 Rogers, J. *Brasenose*.
 Wormald, R. B. *Lincoln*.

CLASSIS V.

One Hundred and Seventeen.

Examiners.

G. Rawlinson.
 W. Hedley.
 F. Meyrick.
 A. S. Farrar.

IN SCIENTIIS MATHEMATICIS ET PHYSICIS.

CLASSIS I.

Walker, R. H. *Wadham*.

CLASSIS II.

Colby, E. R. *Exeter*.
 Hughes, N. T. *Jesus*.

CLASSIS III.

Birley, W. H. *Balliol*.
 Hawkins, Edward G. *Pembroke*.

CLASSIS IV.

Gray, J. B. *St. John's*.
 Joy, S. *Worcester*.
 Liddon, J. *Christ Church*.
 Moens, S. *Merton*.
 Sidgwick, W. *Corpus*.

CLASSIS V.

Sixty.

Examiners.

E. Hill.
 W. Spottiswoode.
 F. Ashpitel.

IN SCIENTIA NATURALI.

CLASSIS I.

Griffith, G. *Jesus*.

CLASSIS II.

Clarke, C. G. *Worcester*.
 Henniker, R. *Trinity*.
 Lloyd, W. H. *Magdalen*.

CLASSIS III.

CLASSIS IV.

CLASSIS V.

One.

Examiners.

N. Story-Maskelyne.
 J. Phillips.
 H. J. S. Smith.

IN JURISPRUDENTIA ET HISTORIA MODERNA.

CLASSIS I.

Baring, A. H. *Christ Church*.
 Hall, W. E. *University*.
 Lee, L. J. *New College*.
 Scott, G. A. J. *Christ Church*.

CLASSIS II.

Holroyd, Hon. D. E. *Christ Church*.
 Leicester-Warren, Hon. J. B. *Christ Ch.*
 Stratton, W. *New College*.
 Thackeray, F. St. J. *Merton*.
 Williams, T. *Oriel*.

CLASSIS III.

Byng, Hon. F. E. C. *Christ Church*.
 Popham, V. W. *Exeter*.
 Swainson, Oswald L. *Brasenose*.

CLASSIS IV.

Charley, W. T. *St. John's*.
 Furnivall, J. *Brasenose*.
 Saunders, Herbert C. *Christ Church*.
 Young, William E. A. *Worcester*.

CLASSIS V.

Sixty-nine.

Examiners.

E. H. Hansell.
 H. G. Cripps.
 G. Marshall.

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

EXAMINATIONS. MATHEMATICAL TRIPOS, 1856.

Moderators. { J. Budd Phear, M. A., *Clare*.
William Henry Besant, M. A., *St. John's*.
Examiners. { Edward John Hillier, M. A., *Trinity*.
Joseph Wolstenholme, M. A., *Christ's*.

In all cases of equality the names are bracketed.

Wranglers.

Ds. Hadley *John's*.
Rigby β *Trinity*.
Clark, C. B. ... } *Queen's*.
Ellis } *Æq.* *Sidney*.
Smith, H. W. ... } *Trinity*.
Hardy β *Trinity*.
Fawcett *Trinity H*.
Moore *Pembroke*.
Harlen *Peter*.
Rouse *Trinity*.
Harpley *John's*.
Atkinson... } *Æq.* *Trinity H*.
Bonney β } *John's*.
Dyson *Emmanuel*.
Duncan..... *Pembroke*.
Pierce *Corpus*.
Kendall..... *John's*.
Long, R. *Corpus*.
Marten *John's*.
Preston ... } *Emmanuel*.
Sharp } *Æq.* *Jesus*.
Street } *Emmanuel*.
Edridge *Emmanuel*.
Glenn..... } *Æq.* *Emmanuel*.
Ward E.... } *Christ's*.
Hall *Jesus*.
Tebay *John's*.
Candy... } *Æq.* *Sidney*.
Clark ... } *Magdalen*.
Browne, G. F. *Catherine*.
Ebdn..... } *Christ's*.
Rowe α ... } *Æq.* *John's*.
Sweeting β } *John's*.
Piper *Trinity*.
Hickling *Clare*.

Senior Optimes.

Ds. Streeter *Clare*.
Cholmeley *Emmanuel*.
Wigan *Trinity*.
Cormack ... } *Æq.* *Queen's*.
Southey ... } *Caius*.
Tatham..... *John's*.

Ds. Glover..... } *John's*.
Howlett ... } *Æq.* *Caius*.
Speer } *Trinity*.
Powley *Jesus*.
Liveing..... *Christ's*.
Martindale *John's*.
Townson *Trinity*.
Gyles *John's*.
Challis } *Æq.* *Trinity*.
Nairne } *Emmanuel*.
Exton γ *John's*.
Stone, H.... } *Æq.* *Trinity*.
Stubbs..... } *Pembroke*.
Acland *Jesus*.
Bury *Emmanuel*.
White *John's*.
Lane..... } *Æq.* *John's*.
Lawson..... } *Trinity*.
Worthington..... *John's*.
Bell..... } *Æq.* *Christ's*.
Nix } *Trinity*.
Brown α *Trinity*.
Smith, R. H. α *John's*.
Penley *Corpus*.
Poulton..... *John's*.
Fish *Caius*.
Gordon..... *John's*.
Pengelley *Queen's*.
Cutler..... } *John's*.
Grover ... } *Æq.* *Emmanuel*.
Mason, G. } *Sidney*.
Ransome *Caius*.

Junior Optimes.

Ds. Elwell *Jesus*.
Wilson α *Magdalen*.
Fenton β *Trinity*.
Lloyd *Pembroke*.
Marshall *Corpus*.
Carter *John's*.
Culley *Trinity*.
Mead *John's*.
Spedding *Trinity*.
Robertson *Trinity*.
Watt's *Christ's*.

Ds. Bostock	<i>Trinity H.</i>
Cheetham	<i>Christ's.</i>
Cutting γ	<i>Corpus.</i>
Collins	<i>Sidney.</i>
Sills	<i>John's.</i>
Knowles	<i>Catherine.</i>
Maclagan	<i>Peter.</i>
Burton	<i>Caius.</i>
Gleadow	<i>John's.</i>
Kelly β	<i>Trinity.</i>
Smith, W. E.	<i>John's.</i>
Kennedy	<i>Caius.</i>
Wilson	<i>Trinity.</i>
Fuller	<i>John's.</i>
Calverley α	<i>Christ's.</i>

Ds. Raby	<i>Clare.</i>
Beach	<i>John's.</i>
Cowie	<i>John's.</i>
Jackson, T. H.	<i>John's.</i>
Barker	<i>Trinity.</i>
Balls γ	<i>Catherine.</i>
Chapman ... }	<i>Trinity.</i>
Darwall β ... }	<i>Æq. Clare.</i>
Stone	<i>Pembroke.</i>
Currey	<i>Magdalen.</i>
Meares	<i>Trinity.</i>
Penfold	<i>Trinity H.</i>
King	<i>Caius.</i>
Nunn J. β	<i>John's.</i>
Marriott β	<i>Corpus.</i>

CLASSICAL TRIPOS. 1856.

<i>Examiners.</i>	{ Arthur Wolfe, M.A., <i>Clare.</i>
	{ Thomas Field, M.A., <i>St. John's.</i>
	{ Augustus Arthur Vansittart, M.A., <i>Trinity.</i>
	{ Robert Godolphin Peter, M.A., <i>Jesus.</i>

First Class.

Ds. Brown	<i>Trinity.</i>
Calverley	<i>Christ's.</i>
Rowe	<i>John's.</i>
Smith, R. H. }	<i>Æq. John's.</i>
Stone }	<i>King's.</i>
Wilson	<i>Magdalen.</i>
Lord	<i>Trinity.</i>
Freer }	<i>Trinity.</i>
Green }	<i>Æq. John's.</i>
Horton }	<i>Peter's.</i>
Mathias	<i>King's.</i>
Aikin }	<i>Æq. Jesus.</i>
Clark }	<i>Trinity.</i>

Second Class.

Ds. Darwall }	<i>Æq. Clare.</i>
Sweeting }	<i>John's.</i>
Chapman }	<i>Emmanuel.</i>
Gee }	<i>Æq. Jesus.</i>
Hay }	<i>Trinity.</i>
Kelly }	<i>Trinity.</i>
Hardy	<i>Trinity.</i>

Evans }	<i>Trinity.</i>
Fenton }	<i>Æq. Trinity.</i>
Marriott }	<i>Corpus.</i>
Cave	<i>Jesus.</i>
Mason }	<i>Trinity.</i>
Nunn }	<i>Æq. John's.</i>
Rigby }	<i>Trinity.</i>
Schreiber	<i>Trinity H.</i>
Bonney	<i>John's.</i>

Third Class.

(*N.B.—This class is arranged in alphabetical order.*)

Ds. Addison	<i>John's.</i>
Balls	<i>Catherine.</i>
Burn	<i>Trinity.</i>
Cutting ...	<i>Corpus.</i>
Day	<i>Catherine.</i>
Exton	<i>John's.</i>
Holmes	<i>Clare.</i>
Hutton	<i>Trinity.</i>
May	<i>Caius.</i>
Neville ...	<i>Magdalen.</i>
Partridge	<i>John's.</i>
Raymond	<i>Magdalen.</i>
Wood	<i>Trinity.</i>

MORAL SCIENCES TRIPOSES.

OFFICIAL EXAMINERS.

The *Professor of Moral Philosophy*, the
Professor of Civil Law, the *Professor of Political Economy*, the *Professor of the Laws of England*, the *Professor of English History*.

Monk *John's*.
Hoopell..... *John's*.
Hoare *Caius*.

Second Class.

Dix *Caius*.
Godson *Pembroke*.

ADDITIONAL. — H. R. Luard, M.A.,
Trinity.

MIDDLE BACHELORS.

First Class.

Webster *Trinity*.

COMMENCING BACHELORS.

First Class.

Gully *Trinity*.
Harrison *Caius*.
Boucher..... *John's*.

Second Class.

Sargent *Trinity*.
Morgan *Trinity*.

NATURAL SCIENCES TRIPOSES.

OFFICIAL EXAMINERS.

The *Regius Professor of Physic*, the
Professor of Chemistry, the *Professor of Anatomy*, the *Professor of Geology*, the *Professor of Botany*, the
Professor of Mineralogy.

ADDITIONAL.—F. J. A. Hort, M.A.,
Trinity.

MIDDLE BACHELORS.

First Class.

Ninnis..... *Clare*.

Second Class.

Burrow *Catherine*.

INCEPTING BACHELORS.

First Class.

Ransome..... *Caius*.

Chancellors' Medallists.

E. L. Brown *Trinity*.
T. B. Rowe..... *John's*.

Smith's Prizemen.

A. V. Hadley *John's*.
J. Rigby *Trinity*.

Bell's Scholarship.

A. Holmes..... *John's*.
H. Sidgwick } *Æg.* *Trinity*.
J. M. Wilson } *John's*.

Porson Prize.

A. Holmes *John's*.

Browne's Medallists.

Greek Ode, C. Stanwell..... *John's*.
Latin Ode, H. Snow..... *John's*.
Epigrams, E. C. Clark *Trinity*.

Seatonian Prize.

J. M. Neal *Trinity*.

Camden Medal.

H. Snow *John's*.

Craven's Scholar.

Arthur Holmes *John's*.

Chancellors' English Medallist.

O. W. Wallace *Emmanuel*.

Members' Prizemen.

T. J. Nunns..... *John's*.

TRIALS, LAW CASES, &c.

THE RUGELEY POISONINGS.—TRIAL OF WILLIAM PALMER.

(*In the Central Criminal Court,*

MAY 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22,
23, 24, 26, 27.)

THE crimes of which William Palmer stood accused or suspected (as briefly stated in the CHRONICLE of the last volume of this work) appeared of so portentous a character, and the means whereby they were affected so subtle and so little within the experience of the best physicists, that the Government thought it their duty—lest there should be any lack of energy, skill, or means on the one hand; and, on the other, that a man popularly believed to have committed such terrible crimes might not be overborne by the prejudices of scientific men or popular indignation—to undertake the investigation officially. For this purpose the case for the Crown was committed to its chief law officer, the Attorney-General. In order, also, to avoid the influences of local feeling on the trial, the Government introduced and carried speedily through Parliament a general measure (the Trial of Offences Act), by which the Court of Queen's Bench, the chief court of criminal jurisdiction, is empowered to order that certain offenders shall be tried at the Central Criminal Court; and the case of William Palmer was ac-

cordingly ordered to be tried there. The experienced Lord Chief Justice (Lord Campbell) himself presided on the bench, with Baron Alderson, from the Court of Exchequer, and Justice Cresswell, from the Common Pleas. The City of London, on whom this arrangement threw a great burden, made the necessary preparations for the accommodation of the Court, and appropriated two other courts and numerous rooms to the witnesses, attorneys, and others engaged in the case.

Every preparation having thus been made for the unprejudiced decision of this *cause célèbre*, the trial commenced in the Central Criminal Court, in the Old Bailey, on the 14th May. A case which had excited such terrible interest in every fireside in England, and which had caused undefined sensations of uneasiness throughout the length and breadth of the land, necessarily drew vast crowds to the spot where the question of guilt or impunity was finally to be decided. Probably a great mischief was avoided by the plan adopted by the sheriffs, by which no persons were admitted into the court without tickets. Great interest was made to obtain these; but as the officers controlled the number issued, the Court was not subjected to great inconvenience. Throughout the trial the seats around the bench were occupied by noblemen and members of Par-

liament, many of whom attended every day to the close:—some of the Judges even came down to the most terrible case of *Oyer* in their day.

Since the case of the Crown was that Mr. Cook had been murdered by means of strychnia, and it was admitted that no strychnia had been found in the body, the case resolved itself into one of circumstantial evidence—a method of proof which requires a wide range of premises, observations, and inductions. Of a trial depending on evidence of this nature, which lasted through twelve entire days, and the *verbatim* reports of which are nearly equal to one of these volumes, it is impossible to make any abstract which shall present to the reader the proofs upon which the verdict was ultimately given. There were several lines of proof, but the incidents of each are necessarily inseparable, and generally so interwoven with the other, that only the entire reproduction of the evidence could enable the reader to form a judicial opinion on the guilt or innocence of the accused. The attempt has therefore been abandoned, and the course selected of giving nearly entire (some portions being condensed, none omitted) the clear statement of the case for the Crown by the Attorney-General, the defence of the prisoner by his able Counsel, and the final and conclusive reply of Sir Alexander Cockburn.

It will be at once seen that the case separated itself into two parts—the direct evidence as to the acts and words of the accused, and the phenomena attending Cook's death, which are matters of positive testimony, from which inferences are to be drawn; and the observations and opinions of men of

science, which are themselves matters of experience and inference, and liable to counter-observation and challenge. It was practicable, and has been thought desirable, that some portions of the direct evidence should be extracted—those portions which, while they form part of the chain of facts in the Attorney-General's speech, could not be presented with that dramatic force with which they came from the mouths of the witnesses. Of the scientific evidence little has been given except that of Sir Benjamin Brodie. The evidence applicable to this case necessarily consisted of the narration of numerous experiments and observations on the effect of this poison strychnia, of the phenomena attending Cook's death, and of the conclusions drawn by the several witnesses. Of the medical testimony called for the defence no portion has been given, for the statement of Serjeant Shee as to the effect of the evidence he was about to call, and the comments of the Attorney-General in reply, present the views of both sides in the fairest manner. Nor will the reader who desires to have a clear insight into this remarkable case have any cause to complain of the course adopted. The conduct of the counsel for the Crown throughout the case was marked by the utmost fairness—by judicial temperateness—and the evidence collected by the Crown solicitors had been communicated before the trial to the prisoner's counsel, who thus had an opportunity of answering every point. Since, however, the absence of the evidence may tend to confuse the mind of a reader accustomed to rely, not on the statements of counsel, but on the testimony

itself, it may be stated that every fact affirmed by the Attorney-General in his opening was supported to the letter by the proper witnesses. The speech for the defence contains few facts, and the reply of the Attorney-General affords a sufficient indication of the value of the witnesses to them. In short, such were the fairness of the Crown counsel, the ability of the prisoner's defenders, and the judicial firmness of the Court, that there has rarely been a case in which the reader may more confidently rely on a judgment formed by a perusal of the arguments of the advocates.

WEDNESDAY, *May 14.*

The Lord Chief Justice, Baron Alderson, and Justice Cresswell having taken their seats,

William Palmer was placed at the bar charged with the wilful murder of John Parsons Cook, at Rugeley, on the 21st of November last.

The prisoner, who is described in the calendar as "William Palmer, 31, surgeon, of superior degree of instruction," was a short and rather stout person, with a round head and face, scanty hair of a light sandy colour, the countenance clear and open, the complexion ruddy: and although the general expression of his countenance was common-place and mean, the opinion formed as to his habits and disposition would probably be favourable—certainly there was nothing in his expression or carriage which indicated cunning or cruelty, or any hardened temperament. Although his features showed no trace of care, they seemed rather the set lineaments of a middle-aged man, than those of one in early manhood. The prisoner's

demeanour throughout the protracted trial was composed and interested, but without the slightest bravado. He attended minutely to every part of the proceedings, very frequently writing notes to his attorney and counsel. Scarcely at any point did he exhibit anxiety, and then he instantly recovered himself. To the last he showed no sign of exhaustion, either physical or mental; and although his features and frame necessarily showed some effects of fourteen days' continuous strain, anxiety as to his fate seemed to have no share in the alteration.

The Attorney-General, Mr. Edwin James, Q.C., Mr. Bodkin, Mr. Welsby, and Mr. Huddleston, appeared for the Crown; Mr. Serjeant Shee, Mr. Grove, Q.C., Mr. Gray, and Mr. Kenealy, for the prisoner.

The prisoner, on being called upon, pleaded *Not Guilty*.

The Attorney-General. — May it please your Lordships: Gentlemen of the Jury:—You are assembled to-day to discharge the most solemn duty that man can be called upon to perform, to sit in judgment, with the issue of life and death in your hands, upon one who stands charged with the highest crime for which man can be arraigned before a worldly tribunal. I am sure that I need not ask your most anxious and earnest attention to such a case, but there is one duty which I feel it incumbent on me to perform. The peculiar circumstances of this case have given it a profound and painful interest throughout the whole country; there is perhaps scarcely a man who has not come to some conclusion upon the issue which you are now to decide. The details have been seized upon with eager avidity—there is scarcely a

society in which the merits of it have not been discussed. Gentlemen, standing here as a minister of justice, with no interest and no desire save that justice shall be done impartially and righteously, I feel it incumbent on me to warn you not to allow any preconceived opinion to operate on your judgment this day. Your bounden duty is to try this case according to the evidence which shall be brought before you, and according to that alone. You must discard from your minds anything you have read or heard, or any opinion you may previously have formed. If the evidence shall satisfy you of the prisoner's guilt, you will discharge your duty to society and to your consciences and the oaths you have taken, by fearlessly pronouncing your verdict accordingly; but, if the evidence shall fail to produce that reasonable conviction on your minds, God forbid that the scale of justice should be inclined against the prisoner by anything of prejudice that should be imported into such an inquiry as this! My duty, gentlemen, will be a simple one; it will be to lay before you the facts upon which the prosecution is founded. I ask your patient attention to them; they are somewhat of a complicated character;—they range over a considerable period of time, because it will be necessary, in order to understand this case, to go back into circumstances of a somewhat antecedent period; but this I may safely say, that in my conscience I believe there is not one single fact to which I am about to ask your patient attention that has not immediate and most important bearing on the case.

Gentlemen, the prisoner at the bar, William Palmer, was by profession a medical practitioner.

He carried on that profession at the town of Rugeley, in Staffordshire, and did so for several years. In later years, however, he became addicted to turf pursuits, which greatly drew off his attention and weaned him from his profession. During the last two or three years, I am informed, he had made over his business, except one or two patients immediately connected with himself, to a person of the name of Thirlby, who had formerly been his assistant, and who is now carrying on, in addition to the business of Palmer, the business of a chemist and druggist in Rugeley. I believe Palmer's name was still ostensibly kept up, but the business had previously been transferred to Thirlby, and Palmer himself had ceased to practise.

In the course of the pursuits connected with the turf he became intimate with the man whose death forms the subject-matter of this inquiry—Mr. Parsons Cook. Now Mr. Cook was a young man of decent family, who had originally been brought up or intended for the profession of the law; he was articulated to a solicitor, but after a time inheriting some property, to the extent, I think, of 12,000*l.* or 13,000*l.*, had become disinclined to a laborious profession, and betook himself also to the turf. He kept race-horses and he betted considerably; and in the course of those pursuits became much connected and familiarly intimate with the prisoner William Palmer. It is for the murder of this Mr. Parsons Cook that the prisoner stands indicted on the present occasion, for the charge against him is that he took away that man's life by poison.

Gentlemen, it will be necessary to show you the circumstances in

which the prisoner William Palmer was then placed, and the position in which he stood relatively to the deceased Mr. Cook; it will be impossible thoroughly to understand this case in all its bearings without those circumstances being detailed to you; and it will be necessary therefore that I should bring them particularly to your attention. The case which, on the part of the prosecution, I have to urge against Palmer, is this,—that being in desperate circumstances, with ruin, disgrace, and punishment staring him in the face, which could only be averted by means of money, he took advantage of his intimacy with Mr. Cook, when Mr. Cook had become the owner of a considerable sum, to destroy him in order to obtain possession of that sum. At the Shrewsbury races in 1855 Mr. Cook was the winner of a considerable sum of money, as I have said before. At that time Palmer was a ruined man, and it is immediately after these races that the transaction which you are to inquire into is alleged to have taken place. Now I shall first proceed to show you what was the position of Palmer at that time, because out of that position, and the circumstances in which Palmer was then placed, spring as we say the motives which induced him to commit this heinous crime. If I show upon evidence which can leave no reasonable doubt on your minds that he committed the crime, motive becomes a matter of secondary importance; nevertheless in an inquiry of this kind it is natural, and it is right, to look to see what may have been the motive by which a man has been impelled to crime. If we find strong motives, the more readily should we be led to believe in the proba-

bility of crime having been committed. If we find a total absence of motive, the probability is the other way. In this case the motive will be matter of very serious consideration; and as the circumstances, out of which we say the motive arises, in this case come first in the order of time, I will deal with them first, before I come to that which is the more immediate subject-matter of our inquiry. It seems to me more convenient to follow the chronological order of events, and I therefore will pursue that course.

Gentlemen, it seems that as early as the year 1853 Palmer had got into pecuniary difficulties—he began to raise money on bills. In the year 1854 his circumstances became worse, and he was at that time indebted to different persons in a large sum of money, and he then had recourse to an expedient which it will be necessary that I should bring before you because it has an important bearing on this case. Among the bills on which Palmer raised money in the course of the year 1854, was a bill for 2000*l.*, which he discounted with Mr. Padwick. That bill bore upon it the acceptance of Palmer's mother, Mrs. Sarah Palmer; she was and is a woman of considerable wealth; and her acceptance being believed to be genuine was a security on which money would be readily advanced. He forged that acceptance, and got money upon it: and that was, if not the beginning, at least one of the early transactions of that nature—for there are a large series of them—in which money was obtained by bills discounted by Palmer, with his mother's acceptances forged upon them. I shall show you by-and-by, that when that reached

its climax it involved him in a state of such peril and emergency, that—as we suggest, but it is for you to form your own conclusions—he had recourse to a desperate expedient in order to avoid the consequences which seemed imminently impending over him. He owed in the year 1854 a very large sum of money; on the 29th of September in that year his wife died; he had an insurance on her life to the amount of 13,000*l.*, and the proceeds of that insurance were realized, and with the 13,000*l.* he paid off some of his most pressing liabilities. He employed for the purpose, with regard to a portion of those liabilities, a gentleman of the name of Pratt, a solicitor in London, who is in the habit of discounting bills, and whose name will be largely mixed up with the subsequent transactions I shall have to detail to you. Mr. Pratt received for him a sum of 8000*l.* and disposed of it in the payment of various liabilities on bills which were in the hands of clients of Mr. Pratt's. Mr. Wright, a solicitor of Birmingham, who had also advanced money to the prisoner, received 5000*l.* more, and thus 13,000*l.* of debt was disposed of; but that still left Palmer with considerable liabilities, and, among others, the bill which I have mentioned of 2000*l.*, discounted by Mr. Padwick, remained unpaid.

This brings us to the close of the year 1854. In the course of that year he effected another insurance in his brother's name, but Palmer was the real party, and corresponded with Mr. Pratt on the subject of effecting that insurance; and the policy for 13,000*l.*, immediately it was effected, was assigned to Palmer. On the strength of

that policy, which remained in the hands of Mr. Pratt, who paid the first premium out of a bill which he discounted for Palmer at the rate of 60 per cent., they proceeded to discount further bills, this policy being kept as a collateral security. The bills in the whole amounted to 12,500*l.* discounted in the course of that year. I find that there were two discounted as early as June, 1854, which were held over from month to month, to keep these bills alive. In March, 1855, two bills of 2000*l.* each were discounted, with the proceeds of which Palmer bought two race-horses, called Nettle and Chicken; the names of which you will hear of again in the course of this narrative. These bills were renewed in June; they became due on the 28th of September and 2nd of October; they were then renewed again, and became due on the 1st and 5th of January, 1856. On the 18th of April, 1855, a bill was discounted for 2000*l.* at three months, which became due on the 22nd of July, and was renewed so as to become due on the 27th of October. On the 23rd of July a bill for 2000*l.* at three months was discounted, which became due on the 25th of October. On the 9th of July a bill for 2000*l.*, at three months, was drawn; that was renewed on the 12th of October, and became due on the 12th of January. On the 27th of September a bill for 1000*l.* was done at three months, the proceeds of which went to pay the renewal on the two bills of 2000*l.* of March due in September, and the bill of the 23rd of July which became due on the 12th of October. So that the account stood thus:—in the month of November, when the Shrewsbury races took

place, and that pressure was put on the prisoner to which I am about to advert, there were in Mr. Pratt's hands a bill due on the 23rd of October for 2000*l.*, another due on the 27th of October for 2000*l.*, two bills due on the 9th of November, which together made 1500*l.*, a bill due on the 10th of December for 1000*l.*, one on the 1st of January for 2000*l.*, on the 5th of January for 2000*l.*, and on the 18th of January 2000*l.*: making in the whole 12,500*l.* But it seemed in July he contrived to pay 1000*l.*, therefore there remained due at this period in the month of November 11,500*l.*, and every one of these bills bore the forged acceptance of the prisoner's mother. You will therefore understand the pressure which naturally and necessarily arose upon him; the pressure on the liabilities of 11,500*l.*, which he had not a shilling in the world to meet, and the still greater pressure which arose from the consciousness that the moment he could no longer go on—that his mother should be resorted to for payment—the fact of his having committed these forgeries would at once become manifest and known, and would bring on him the penalty of the law for that crime so committed.

Now in these transactions the deceased Mr. Cook had been only partially interested. I should mention, however, before I go into the further history of the case, that the prisoner's brother died in the month of August, 1855. The life had been insured, and the policy assigned to the prisoner, for 13,000*l.*, and he, of course, expected that the proceeds of that insurance would pay off these liabilities; but, as I shall show you presently, the office in

which the insurance had been effected declined to pay, and consequently there was no assistance to be derived from that source.

Gentlemen, I was about to say that Mr. Cook had been to a certain extent, but only to a very limited extent, mixed up with the prisoner in these pecuniary transactions to which I have been adverting. It seems that in the month of May, 1855, Palmer was pressed to pay a sum of 500*l.* to a person of the name of Serjeant, I believe, on a bill transaction. He had in the hands of Mr. Pratt at that time, arising from these bill transactions, a balance of 310*l.* to his credit, and he wanted Mr. Pratt to advance the 190*l.* necessary to make up the 500*l.* Mr. Pratt declined to do that except on security; on which Palmer offered him the acceptance of Mr. Cook, representing Mr. Cook to be a man of substance and of good security; and accordingly the acceptance of Mr. Cook for 200*l.* was sent up, and on that Mr. Pratt advanced the money. I believe this was the first transaction of the kind with Mr. Cook. I do not know that it has any immediate bearing on the subject, further than this, that I am anxious, as far as I know, to lay before you all the circumstances which show the relation between Palmer and Cook. That bill of 200*l.*, when it became due, Palmer failed to provide for, and Mr. Cook had to provide for, it himself, which he did, and the bill was paid, after having first been dishonoured. Then in the August of that year a transaction took place, to which again it will be necessary that I should call your particular attention. In the August of that year, 1855, Palmer writes to Mr. Pratt

he must have 1000*l.* more on the next Saturday. Mr. Pratt declined to advance the 1000*l.* without security, on which Mr. Palmer offered the security of Mr. Cook's acceptance for 500*l.*, representing him as a man of means and wealth; but Mr. Pratt still declined to advance the money without some more tangible security than the mere personal security of Mr. Cook's acceptance. Now Palmer represented this as a transaction in which Mr. Cook required the money, and it may be that that was the fact. I have no means of ascertaining now how that stood, but I will give him the credit to suppose it was true, and that it was a transaction in which he had the acquiescence of Mr. Cook for the proposals he was making to Mr. Pratt. Mr. Cook was engaged upon the turf, sometimes winning, sometimes losing, purchasing horses, and it may perfectly well be that at that time he required this loan of 500*l.*, as represented by Palmer. Mr. Pratt, as I said before, declined to advance the money except upon more available security; upon which Palmer proposed an assignment by Mr. Cook of two race-horses belonging to Mr. Cook—the one called Polestar, the horse that afterwards won at Shrewsbury races, and the other called Sirius; and an assignment was accordingly prepared: this assignment was afterwards executed by Mr. Cook, in favour of Mr. Pratt, as a collateral security for this sum of 500*l.* Now that being so, on this representation Mr. Cook was entitled to the money, that is to say, to so much money as could be realized upon the security. The whole of that 500*l.* was not to be paid on the terms on which

Mr. Pratt advanced money; the arrangement was that Mr. Pratt should give for the acceptance of 500*l.* at three months, and the assignment of these two horses, a sum of 375*l.* in money, a wine-warrant for 65*l.* (of course, I need not tell you, never realized), discount for three months on the amount for which it was given, 50*l.*, and expenses 10*l.*, making in the whole 500*l.* Now at all events Mr. Cook was entitled to the 375*l.* in cash, and the wine-warrant for 65*l.* Palmer contrived that the cheque and the wine-warrant should be sent to him, and not sent to Mr. Cook: he wrote to Mr. Pratt, desiring that Mr. Pratt would forward them to him at the Post-office, Doncaster, as he was there to see Mr. Cook. He was not to see Mr. Cook there, for Mr. Cook was not there; but by these means Palmer got the cheque and the wine-warrant into his own hands. Mr. Pratt sent down this cheque, which was on his bankers in London, in this form: sending it to a man in the country, he sent it on a stamp, as the Act of Parliament requires. He affixed to the face of the cheque a receipt stamp, and availed himself of the opportunity now afforded by the law, of striking out the word "bearer," and writing "order." The effect of this was, as you are all no doubt aware, to necessitate the endorsement of Mr. Cook upon the back of the cheque or order. It was not intended by Palmer that these proceeds should find their way into Mr. Cook's hands, and accordingly he forged the name of "John Parsons Cook" on the back of that cheque. He then paid the cheque into his banker's at Rugeley: the proceeds were realized, paid by the bankers

in London, and went to the credit of Palmer, who had the advantage of the cash. Mr. Cook never had the money, and you will see that about the period to which I am referring, when Mr. Cook came to his end, this bill, which was a bill at three months, in respect of these transactions of September 10, was becoming due—it would be due in the course of ten days—and when it became due it would appear that Palmer had had the money, and that, in order to get the money which ought to have come to Mr. Cook, he had forged the endorsement of Mr. Cook on this cheque.

Gentlemen, I wish this was the only transaction in which Mr. Cook had been mixed up with the prisoner Palmer; but there is another to which it is necessary to refer. In the September of 1855, Palmer's brother having died, but the profits of the insurance not having been realized, he induced a person of the name of Bates to propose his life to be insured, or rather, he induced Bates to do this. He had succeeded in raising money on former insurances, and I have no doubt he pressed or induced Mr. Cook to assist him in this transaction, with the view to enable him, by representing Bates as a man of substance and worth, and producing a policy on Bates's life, to get further advances for the collateral security on that policy. I put it no higher, and do not suppose Mr. Cook would have been a party to any other transaction; but it seems on the 5th of September Mr. Bates, the prisoner, and Mr. Cook were together at Rugeley. Mr. Bates was a person who had before been better off in the world, but who had fallen into decay, and who had been com-

pelled to accept employment from Palmer in the shape of a sort of superintendent of his stables. He was a hanger-on of Palmer's, working in his stables, though in rather a better position; but the man had run through everything, and had nothing left; he was a healthy young man, and Palmer proposed to him to insure his life, and produced that common form of a proposal which we are all familiar with. Mr. Bates said, "No, I do not want to insure my life," and declined the notion of such a thing. Palmer pressed him, and Mr. Cook interposed and said, "You had better do it; it will be for your benefit; you are quite safe with Palmer;" and they pressed him to sign the proposal for this insurance for no less a sum than 25,000*l.*, Cook attesting this proposal, which Palmer filled in, referring to Palmer as the medical attendant, and referring to his assistant Thirlby as the referee and friend who was to speak to this man's habits; and these proposals were sent up, I think, to the Solicitors' and General Office. That office not being disposed to effect this insurance, they then sent up another for 10,000*l.* to the Midland Office on the same life of Bates; in each case further information was required as to the position of this man; and then, instead of it turning out that he was a gentleman of responsibility and means, it turned out that he was a mere person in the establishment of Palmer. The office was not satisfied, and the thing dropped.

Gentlemen, that failed; and no money could be obtained on the security of that policy; it may be important in more ways than one, but it is important in this respect

that it shows the desperate straits in a pecuniary point of view into which the prisoner had at that time come,

Now that failing, we go back to the insurance on the brother's life, and I find by the correspondence which took place between Palmer and Mr. Pratt, that Mr. Pratt at this time, having applied to the office at which the insurance on the brother's life—Walter Palmer—had been effected, found a difficulty in getting the money, and thereupon began to press Palmer for immediate payment of his bills. [*The Letters read.*]

On the 6th of November two writs were issued for 4000*l.*, one against Palmer himself, the other against his mother. But Mr. Pratt writes to him on the 6th November to say he has sent the writs to Mr. Crabb, but that they should not be served until he sent further directions, and he strongly urges him to make good arrangements, and also to come up and make an arrangement as to a bill for 1500*l.* which was coming due on the 9th of the month. On the 10th of November, the day on which he said in a former letter he would delay the service of the writs to, Palmer went up and paid a sum of 300*l.*; he had paid before two sums of 250*l.*, one personally, and one acknowledged by Mr. Pratt, and which three sums made up a sum of 800*l.* Mr. Pratt deducted from this 200*l.* for two months' discount, and that left 600*l.* to the credit of the first bill coming due, which was a bill of the 25th of October; that left therefore 1400*l.* of the 2000*l.* bill still payable. On the 13th of November, which is a very important day, for it is a day on which Polestar won at Shrewsbury, he writes a letter referring to

the Prince of Wales Policy, and said steps would be taken to enforce it. That, gentlemen, was the state of things in which he was placed at the period of the last letter, dated the 13th of November, and you will find from this correspondence that Mr. Pratt, held at that time 12,500*l.* of bills in his hand, minus the 600*l.* to which I adverted, and which had been paid off on this, leaving also about 10,000*l.* of bills, the whole of which bore the forged acceptances of Palmer's mother, acceptances either forged by him, or by some one at his desire, and for which therefore he was criminally responsible; and you find that, the Prince of Wales Office declining to pay the sum for which the brother's life had been insured—the 13,000*l.*—Mr. Pratt, who held that policy as a collateral security, could no longer go on, would not have been justified in further renewing these bills; and therefore had issued writs against the mother, which were forthwith to be served in case Palmer did not find the means of at all events paying off a portion, and enabling Mr. Pratt to justify himself to his clients in withholding further legal proceedings.

Now this being the state of things, we come to the events connected with the races at Shrewsbury. Mr. Cook was the owner, as you are now aware, of a mare called Polestar, and she was entered for the Shrewsbury handicap. She was very advantageously weighted, and Cook believed that the mare would win, and he betted (for him) largely upon that event. The race was run on the 13th of November, the very day on which the last letter was written, which would reach Palmer on the next

day, the 14th; and the result of the race was this,—Polestar winning, Cook was entitled in the first place to the stakes. Those stakes amounted to 424*l.*, but subject to certain deductions, leaving a net sum of 381*l.* 19*s.* to the credit of Cook. He had also betted largely upon the race, partly for himself, and I am told partly on commission. The result was, his betting book showed a winning which amounted together with the stakes to 2050*l.* He had been during the previous week at the Worcester races, and I shall show that at Shrewsbury he had in his pocket,—besides the stakes which he was entitled to receive in London, and that sum he would be entitled to be paid at Tattersall's at the settling—he had in his pocket a sum of between 700*l.* and 800*l.* at Shrewsbury. The stakes he would receive through Messrs. Wetherby, the racing agents in London, with whom he kept an account. The stakes would be sent up in the ordinary course of things to Messrs. Wetherby, and Mr. Cook would be entitled to draw on Messrs. Wetherby for the amount. He received many of his bets on the course, and had a sum of 700*l.* or 800*l.* in his pocket. This race being run on the Monday, he would be entitled on the ensuing Monday to receive his bets at Tattersall's, which amounted, as we shall afterwards find, to 1020*l.*

Now within a week of that time Mr. Cook died, and the important inquiry of to-day is, how he came by his death; whether by natural means, or whether by the hand of man; and if the latter, by whose hand?

Gentlemen, I must tell you first the state of health in which he was at the time he went down to Shrews-

bury; it will be very important in the course of this inquiry. He was a young man about twenty-eight when he died, slightly disposed to pulmonary complaints; delicate in that respect, but otherwise a hale and hearty young man. [The Attorney-General proceeded to state, that Cook imagined himself to be suffering from venereal disease, but that having consulted a medical friend, Dr. Savage, it proved to be entirely without grounds; and in fact, he was suffering simply from debility.]

Gentlemen, having seen Dr. Savage, he went to the Shrewsbury races, and, as I have told you, his horse won. After the race he was naturally excited, as a man would be who had got to a low ebb with regard to his pecuniary affairs—he was rejoiced his mare had won, especially as it brought him a considerable amount of money, and he was more or less excited, as a man might naturally be under those circumstances. He asked various friends to dine with him to celebrate the event. They met at the Raven Hotel, and had two or three bottles of champagne. I am told it will be said he became the worse for liquor on that occasion. There is not the slightest foundation for the suggestion. He was an abstemious man at all times. On this occasion he may have taken a glass or two of champagne to celebrate the event at which he rejoiced—that was all. He went to bed with nothing the matter with him, got up the next day and went on the course as usual. That night, the night of the 14th of November, a remarkable incident happened, to which I beg to call your attention. A friend of his, a Mr. Fisher, occupied a room at the Raven with a

Mr. Herring, both of them being sporting men. Mr. Fisher, in addition to being a sporting man, does agency in the way of receiving the winnings of persons who have won on the turf. He was agent for Cook, and from time to time received Cook's bets on the settling day at Tattersall's. Fisher, with this person named Herring, was at the Shrewsbury races, and they occupied the next room to that occupied by Palmer and Cook, for Palmer and Cook had gone together from Rugeley to the races at Shrewsbury. Late in the evening Fisher, who had been invited by Cook to come and have a glass of brandy-and-water in his room, went into the room in which Palmer and Cook were, and found them sitting at conversation at a table, Cook having a tumbler half full of brandy-and-water before him. Fisher went in and sat down, and Cook invited him to have something to drink, at the same time saying to Palmer, "You will have some more?" "No," says Palmer, "not unless you finish your glass." On which Cook said, "That is soon done." He took up his glass half-full of brandy-and-water, and tossed it off at one gulp, leaving a teaspoonful at the bottom of the tumbler. He had scarcely swallowed it when he said, "Good God! there is something in it that burns my throat." Palmer took up the glass and drank what remained, and said, "There is nothing in it." Pushing the glass to Fisher and to Read, who came in at the moment, he said, "Cook fancies there is something in the brandy-and-water: taste it." On which they said, "It is very easy to say taste it, but you have left none." Within a few minutes

Cook suddenly left the room. He returned after a few minutes and called Fisher out, and told him he was taken violently ill. Fisher went out with him. He was then taken with violent vomitings. After a little while he was so bad that it was necessary to take him to bed. He was taken to bed, and vomited then again and again in the most violent way. It became necessary to send for a medical man. These vomitings continued for a couple of hours, the man retching with the greatest violence. The medical gentleman proposed an emetic, which the prisoner would not hear of. They got him warm water, and put a tooth-brush to his throat, to make him eject what he had taken. However, there was no occasion for that, for the vomiting went on. After that, some stimulants were given to him, some comforting matter, and after that a pill and a purgative dose. After about two or three hours he became more tranquil, and about two or three o'clock he fell asleep and slept till the next morning. Such was the state of the man's feeling at that time; I cannot tell you what passed, because that is not evidence, but I can state this fact: he gave to Fisher the money he had about him, desiring him to take care of it, and Fisher will tell you the money amounted to between 700*l.* and 800*l.* in a large roll of notes, so that we have by that means the opportunity of getting at the sum which at that time he had about him personally.

The next morning, after having passed a more tranquil night, he was better. After a short time he got up and went out on the course, feeling himself better. He

saw Fisher, and Fisher gave him back his notes, which he had therefore, as we prove, on the Thursday morning. The next day, on the Thursday morning, he was out, looking and feeling very ill, but the vomiting having ceased. On that day a horse of the prisoner's ran at Shrewsbury, called Chicken. He had backed that horse heavily, and the horse lost. I will show when Palmer went to Shrewsbury he had no money, and he was reduced to the necessity of borrowing 25*l.* in order to get to Shrewsbury. His horse lost, and he lost bets on the race. After this he and Cook left Shrewsbury and returned to Rugeley, Cook going to the Talbot Arms, an hotel at Rugeley, which is exactly opposite to the prisoner's house, and there Cook took up his abode.

Now, gentlemen, there is one incident connected with this Shrewsbury part of the story, to which, before I quit Shrewsbury, it is necessary I should call your particular attention. I have stated to you that this happened on the night of the Wednesday—how Cook, having taken this glass of brandy-and-water, was suddenly taken ill, and remained ill for several days. On that same night a woman of the name of Mrs. Brookes had occasion to see Palmer at the Raven Hotel. She knew he was staying there. She is, I am told, a remarkable person—remarkable in this respect, that though a female, she is connected with the turf; she bets on commission. She has at her disposal an establishment of jockeys for whom she acts as a sort of registrar, and for whom she makes engagements. The prisoner's horse was to run the next day, and she came on

that night to speak to him about a jockey whom he wanted to employ to ride his horse. She came up stairs somewhere about eleven o'clock, and turned into a lobby into which Palmer's room opened. As she turned into the lobby she saw Palmer, whom she knew perfectly well, holding up a tumbler to the light of the gas which was burning in the passage, looking at it with the caution of a man who was watching to see what was the condition of the liquid. Having looked at it through the gaslight, he withdrew to his own room, and presently returned with the glass in his hand, and then went into the room where Cook was, and in which room Cook drank the brandy-and-water, from which, I dare say, you will be disposed to infer that his sickness was occasioned.

Now, gentlemen, I do not allege it was by means of anything which caused this sickness that his death was occasioned, but I will show you throughout the ensuing days at Rugeley that he constantly received things from the prisoner's hands, and that during those days Cook's sickness was perpetually going on. I will show you that after he died antimony was found in the tissues of his body, and antimony was found in his blood. Antimony administered in its usual state as a tartaric emetic is one of the greatest irritants that can be introduced into the stomach, and if taken must cause great sickness; but it was not that of which this man died. The charge is, that he was killed—having been prepared for the reception of the poison by antimony,—that he was killed by strychnine; and before I introduce to you the scenes which took place

at Rugeley, which I shall have to detail to you, let me give you some information with regard to the character of the poison.

You have heard, I dare say, of the vegetable product known by the term of *nux vomica*. In that nut or bean there resides a fatal poison capable of being extracted from it by the skill of man; of this the most minute quantity is fatal to animal life: from half a grain to three-quarters of a grain will destroy life. You may imagine, therefore, how minute is the dose that will prove fatal. It acts immediately on the nerves and muscles of motion of the human body. In the human organization the nervous system may be divided into two main parts—the nerves of sensation, by which the consciousness of all external sensation is conveyed to the brain; and the nerves of motion, which are, as it were, the intermediate agents between the intellectual power of man and the physical action which arises from his organization. Those are the two branches, having their seat, or rather their origin, in the immediate vicinity of man's intellectual existence. They are entirely distinct throughout the whole of their ramifications, and the one set of nerves may be affected while the others are left undisturbed. You may paralyze the nerves of sensation, and you may leave the nerves which act on the voluntary muscles, the muscles of movement will be unaffected; or you may reverse the situation of things and affect the nerves of volition, leaving the nerves of sensation totally undisturbed. Strychnia, it appears, affects the nerves which act on the voluntary muscles, and leaves wholly untouched the nerves on

which human consciousness depends; and it is important to bear in mind this distinction. Some poisons, as you know, overpower the consciousness of man, and produce a total absence of all sensation, and so terminate in death; but the poison to which I am referring affects the voluntary action of the muscles of the body, leaving altogether unimpaired the consciousness at that time. Now the way in which, acting on the voluntary muscles, strychnia is fatal to life is this: it produces the most intense excitement of all these muscles, violent convulsions take place, spasms which affect the whole muscles of the body; these, after a series of convulsive throes, end in rigidity—all the muscles become, after fearful cramps, fixed, and especially the respiratory muscles, within which the lungs have their play, are fixed with rigidity. By that means respiration is prevented, and death necessarily ensues. The symptoms are known to medical men under the term of *tetanus*, that is to say, convulsive motion of the muscles. Under that form of tetanus you have the utmost rigidity produced;—convulsions followed by rigidity, the legs distended, the feet curved out of their natural position, the muscles of the chest fixed; the muscles of the back, which hold the head in its erect position, forced back by the intensity of their excited retention; the head is thrown back, and the body assumes the form of a bow, resting on the back of the head and the heels. That is the form in which death arises from strychnia. It is at the same time right to say that *tetanus*, producing death, arises from other causes as well as strychnia; but there

are characteristic differences which, I believe, prevent the possibility of a mistake to those who are connected with this department of science. There is what is called traumatic *tetanus*, from the Greek word *trauma*, signifying a wound. You have often heard of lock-jaw arising from a cut, or the ulceration of some part of the body. There is also what is called idiopathic *tetanus*, which, as arising from disease, generally from sudden chill, produces this state of rigor of the muscular system; but there is the most marked difference between them.

Gentlemen, I have reason to believe that an attempt will be made, when I have shown you the symptoms which attended this man's death, to confound these different classes of disease. Therefore it is in the outset, before I introduce the symptoms that attended Mr. Cook's death, necessary to distinguish between these classes of cases; and the marked distinction is this:—In the first place, with regard to idiopathic *tetanus*, it is hardly ever known in this country to prove fatal. The instances are extremely rare. In hotter climates it is a form of death not unfrequent. In this country it not unfrequently happens, but death resulting from it is a most unusual occurrence. Traumatic *tetanus* is a thing of more frequent occurrence. There are very few medical practitioners who have not heard of such cases, and few hospitals in which such cases do not occur. With regard to traumatic *tetanus*, in this case that is out of the question, because I shall show you a fortnight before his death this young man had nothing the matter with him; I

shall show you, at the time of his death and after his death, there was nothing throughout his whole system in the shape of a wound—the only thing which could have produced from external causes traumatic *tetanus*. If it be suggested this may have been a form of idiopathic *tetanus*, the answer will be this—there is this distinction between the known forms of *tetanus* and the *tetanus* which arises from strychnia—in the cases of idiopathic and traumatic *tetanus*—in the natural *tetanus*, the *tetanus* from wounds—the disease comes on with milder symptoms at first, gradually progressing towards the development and the final completion of the disease, but always without intermission. When once it has begun, though—as in every other disease, as we know—the paroxysms will be from time to time more or less intense, and as still from the commencement to the close the paroxysms continue their course as human diseases usually do, from the milder form from the commencement to the more aggravated form and condition on to the end—that is not so in *tetanus* from strychnia; that comes on in paroxysms which may subside for a time and be renewed. But there is this further and more striking and remarkable difference. In the case of *tetanus* of idiopathic or traumatic cases, the disease necessarily occupies a considerable number of hours, sometimes two or three days, at all events twenty-four or twelve hours. I believe there is hardly even an instance known in which it was so small a time as eight or nine hours; but here we are dealing with a case not of hours but of minutes, in which there is no continuing of the disease to the gradual develop-

ment of its climax, till its end; but in this the paroxysms came on, as they do by strychnia, with all their power and force from the commencement, and after a few short minutes and a few fearful struggles, the agony terminated in the dissolution of the victim. That is the distinction, and, having drawn your attention to this distinction, I will now proceed to tell you what took place at Rugeley. There is, however, this observation of which my friend reminds me. Mr. Palmer was a medical man, understanding the use of strychnia and its effects. It had not escaped his attention. I have a book before me which was found at his house after his arrest. It is a book called 'The Manual for Students preparing for Examination at Apothecaries' Hall,' and I find written on the first page of it, in his own handwriting, "Strychnia kills by causing tetanic fixing of the respiratory muscles." I do not want to attach more importance to it than that deserves. All knowledge relating to poisons legitimately belongs to the department of science which he professes, and there is nothing in the fact that in any book belonging to him a note should be found relating to this poison. I use that only to this extent—that the use of strychnia and its effect on human life had come to his particular and personal attention.

Gentlemen, I will add this while I am on the subject of strychnia. I shall produce before you a body of medical evidence to show you the distinction between the form of *tetanus* which may be called the natural form of *tetanus*, and *tetanus* resulting from the administration of strychnia. Happily, the cases in which death arises from strychnia

are very rare. The experience of the medical profession has been limited on the subject; but it so happens there have been several cases in which the death, of which the proximate cause was *tetanus*, was, beyond all possibility of doubt, traced to the administration, accidentally or otherwise, of strychnia. I will have the medical men before you, before this case is over, who attended the different cases of death from strychnia. I have a body of medical testimony to show you what is the form of death and the symptoms and appearance of *tetanus* arising from natural causes, or from external injury; and you will find that the symptoms and the appearances which I am about to detail to you are exactly those of the deaths which have taken place from strychnia, and have the characteristic difference to which I have just now adverted, as distinguishing them from death arising from *tetanus* produced by the other means. With these observations, which I hope have not wearied you, I will now come to what took place after the arrival of these parties at Rugeley.

Gentlemen, they arrived there on the night of Thursday the 15th of November, between the hours of 10 and 11. Cook, on being asked how he was, said he had been poorly at Shrewsbury; but it did not appear to the people at the inn that there was anything to indicate the presence of serious complaint, and he took some refreshment and went to bed. He got up the next morning and went out and dined that day with Palmer, came back to the inn, I think about 10 o'clock that evening, perfectly sober, and went to bed. I call attention to this, because you will hear the account.

the prisoner gave of him the next day or the day after. He appeared to be well, and went to bed without anything to lead one to suppose there was anything unusual the matter with him. The next morning at an early hour Palmer was with him, and from that time, during the whole of Saturday and Sunday, he was constantly in attendance on him. He ordered him some coffee. Coffee was brought up by the chambermaid, Elizabeth Mills. It was taken into the room, given to the prisoner, and she left; Palmer, having received the coffee, gave it to the man, who was in bed, and had, therefore, an opportunity of dealing with it. Immediately after that the same symptoms set in which had taken place at Shrewsbury. Throughout the whole of that day and the next day the prisoner constantly administered everything to Cook, and Cook is tormented with this incessant and troublesome vomiting. Toast-and-water was brought over that morning from Palmer's house—not made in the inn, where it might have been made, but it is brought over from Palmer's own house. About 11 or 12 o'clock a basin of broth was brought over. There might be nothing in that; but now mark the circumstances. It seems that Palmer desired a woman of the name of Rowley, who will be called before you, to go to an inn in Rugeley, the Albion, to get some broth. The woman got the broth, took it to Palmer's house, and put it in a saucepan on the kitchen fire to warm. She had something to do in the back kitchen, and went into the back kitchen—she saw no more of the broth, or Palmer, until Palmer, having poured it into a basin,

brought it to her, told her to take it over to the Talbot Arms, and to tell any one to whom she might give it to take it up to Cook, and say Smith had sent it. It seems there was a Mr. Jeremiah Smith, an intimate friend of Palmer's, whose name he used on this occasion. The broth was taken up to Mr. Cook, who tried to swallow a spoonful of it; it immediately made him sick, and he brought it off his stomach; the broth was taken down stairs again. After a little while the prisoner came across, and asked if Mr. Cook had had his broth; they said no; that he had tried to take it, but that it made him sick, and he could not keep it on his stomach. Palmer said he must take it; he went up stairs and desired the broth to be brought up again, and insisted on Cook taking some of it, which he did; the consequence was he immediately began to vomit again, and threw it off his stomach. Now of that broth, Elizabeth Mills, the chambermaid, when it had been taken down stairs in consequence of Mr. Cook's not being able to keep it on his stomach in the first instance, saying "it was very nice looking broth," took a couple of tablespoonfuls. Within half an hour of that time the woman was taken violently ill; vomiting came on, which lasted five or six hours; she was obliged to go to bed at 12 o'clock in the day; she could not get up till 5 or 6 in the afternoon; and in the course of that time she will tell you she vomited not less than twenty times; these being exactly the same symptoms which manifested themselves in Cook's person after he drank the glass of brandy-and-water at Shrewsbury. On this Saturday Mr. Bamford, who is a medical practitioner at

Rugeley, was called in, and he went to see Mr. Cook at half-past 3; Palmer told him the man had a bilious attack, that he had dined with him the day before, and had drank too freely of champagne, which had disordered his stomach. On one or two occasions I shall show Palmer to have represented to Cook his suffering under bilious diarrhœa; he so spoke of his complaint at Shrewsbury, and to every one to whom he speaks or writes relating to Mr. Cook he represents the symptoms which appeared at Shrewsbury as being those of bilious diarrhœa. Now, I shall show you by a medical practitioner at Shrewsbury, and by Mr. Bamford, and by another medical man at Rugeley, that, while there was this vehement vomiting on both occasions, there was not a single bilious symptom at any time. Mr. Bamford comes in at half-past 3; he finds Mr. Cook suffering from violent vomiting; and he states the stomach was in so irritable a state that it would not retain a tablespoonful of anything; he naturally tried to see what the symptoms could be which might lead him to form a notion as to the cause of these painful symptoms. He found to his surprise that the man's pulse was perfectly natural, only at 70, his tongue was quite clean, his skin was quite moist, there was not the slightest trace of fever, or any one of those symptoms which would be expected in a bilious attack. Having heard from Palmer that he ascribed it to an excess on the part of Mr. Cook in taking wine the day before, he said to Mr. Cook, "I understand you have taken wine, and that that is the cause of it." "Well," said Cook, "I suppose I must have

done so; but it is very odd, I only took two glasses." This was said in Palmer's presence; so that it turned out the representation that Mr. Cook had taken an excess of champagne the day before was incorrect, for he had only taken a couple of glasses, which could hardly be supposed to occasion these consequences. Mr. Bamford prescribed some effervescing saline medicine. He saw Mr. Cook again that evening, when he found the sickness still continued; and I should state, after he went away the prisoner ordered more coffee for Mr. Cook. Coffee was brought up at 4 o'clock, and he vomited immediately; at 6 o'clock they took him up some barley-water; Palmer was not there, and it did not produce the usual vomiting; at 8 o'clock they took him up arrowroot; Palmer was there, the vomiting took place, and the arrowroot was brought up.

Gentlemen, these may be mere coincidences, nevertheless it is a fact worthy of attention that throughout the whole of that Saturday Palmer was constantly in and out, ministering to him a variety of things, and whenever he did administer anything to him, sickness invariably ensued. That evening Mr. Bamford came again, and found the sickness still continuing; he prepared two opiate pills for him to quiet the action of the stomach. I will state the contents of those pills, that it may be understood what medicine he took; they consisted of half a grain of morphia, half a grain of calomel, and four grains of rhubarb. I pray your attention to the contents of those pills, because by-and-by you will see as I go on to the ensuing nights the great importance of attending to the ingredients of those

pills. That takes us through Saturday, and leaves the man still suffering at the close of that day from the vomiting which had commenced in the morning.

Gentlemen, I now go to the Sunday. In the morning between 7 and 8 o'clock of that day, Mr. Bamford is fetched by Palmer to Mr. Cook, and finds the sickness continuing; but he finds to his surprise that no symptoms of bile made their appearance at all, and he was at a total loss to conjecture what could occasion this sickness. He changes the form of his medicine. He visits him again in the evening; he will tell you he saw what Mr. Cook brought up. He was constantly vomiting, but it was as clear as water, without the slightest appearance of bilious secretion. On the Sunday evening he sees him again, the sickness still going on, no fever, the skin moist, and the tongue clean. He tried what the effect of pressure would be on the stomach or abdomen, and there was no pain. The excretions from the body were natural, and there were no symptoms of bile of any sort. That closes the Sunday, and we now come to a very important day, namely, Monday the 19th.

Gentlemen, on the morning of Monday the 19th Palmer left Rugeley to go to London, and I will show you presently what he went to London for. On that morning, before he left, he came over early to the hotel, and he ordered a cup of coffee to be made for Mr. Cook; he took up the coffee himself and gave it to Mr. Cook, and Mr. Cook, as usual, vomited immediately after swallowing the coffee. After that Palmer left. Mr. Bamford came to the hotel, and found Mr. Cook still suffering from the vomiting; he gave him a

new medicine, which consisted of half a drachm of henbane, three drachms of tincture of magnesia, and two of simple syrup, a quarter to be taken every three or four hours. Whether from the effect of that medicine, or whether it was that no longer anything was given to him which could cause the irritation under which he was before suffering, but from that time the greatest improvement manifested itself in Mr. Cook. Palmer was not present the whole of that day; he had gone to London. Mr. Cook throughout that day is better. Mr. Bamford goes about 12 or 1 o'clock, and finds a most marked improvement. Gentlemen, it might have been the result of the medicine; but the man is well comparatively, and Mr. Bamford recommends him to get up; he gets up, washes and dresses; he recovers his freshness and spirits, sits up for several hours, and sees several persons. So he continued until night. He took in the mean time coffee and broth, and was enabled to keep them on his stomach; and so things continued until a late hour that evening. Palmer, as I told you, went to town on the Monday morning; and as I have considered it most convenient in this case to follow the order of events in strict chronological series, I will now interrupt the further inquiry of what passed afterwards at Rugeley, in order to follow Palmer through the events in which he was concerned on the Monday in London.

He had written to a person of the name of Herring to meet him that day at a house in Beaufort Buildings. As I have told you, Herring was a man upon the turf; he was one of those who had been to Shrewsbury, and who knew Mr. Cook, and who can speak to that

part of the case as to Mr. Cook's illness at Shrewsbury. But the important part of Herring's evidence is what I am now about to narrate. On seeing Palmer he first inquired after Mr. Cook. Palmer said, "He is all right; his doctor has given him a dose of calomel, and as the weather is wet and cold he is not to come out to-day: what I want to see you about is settling his account."

The Monday, you will recollect I told you, was the settling-day at Tattersall's, and on that day it was necessary that Mr. Cook's bets which he had won should be realized. Now his usual agent for that purpose was Fisher, and the probability is, I cannot but think, that if he sent up his account to be realized at Tattersall's that day by Palmer, he would desire Palmer, if he did not go to Tattersall's himself, to give it to the usual agent, that the bets might be got in by him. Palmer was a defaulter at Tattersall's, and could not present himself there, but there was Fisher, who was the usual agent for that purpose. Herring, naturally enough, was surprised on hearing that he was to get in Mr. Cook's debts; but, however, he undertook to do so. Palmer produced a piece of paper, which he said contained the list of the sums which Mr. Cook was entitled to receive, and he mentioned the names of the different persons of whom Mr. Cook had won money, with the sums which they were respectively liable to Mr. Cook for. Herring held out his hand to take the paper, upon which Palmer said, "I will not give you this, I will keep it myself; here is a bit of paper," tearing off a piece from a letter; "write down what I will read to you, I will keep this paper and it

will be a check against you." He then dictated to him the names of different persons, with the sums for which they were liable, and then said, "How much do you make that come to?" upon which Herring said "1020*l*." "Very well," says Palmer, "then pay yourself 6*l*." I suppose there was some bet, or something due to him, or the commission. "Pay Shelley 30*l*.; if you see Bell, tell him Mr. Cook will pay him when he comes up on Thursday or Friday;" and then he says, "Deducting 30*l*., how much do you make that?"—"983*l*," says Herring. "Yes," says Palmer, "that is what he makes it; I will give you 16*l*., and that will make 1000*l*.; pay yourself for my bill 200*l*." That is a bill which he owed to Herring, which was overdue, and which it was necessary should be paid.—"Pay Mr. Padwick 350*l*., and pay Mr. Pratt 450*l*." I have showed you from the correspondence how it had become absolutely necessary to avoid the issuing of the writs, or, at all events, their service upon his mother, and all the consequences which would ensue from the disclosure which must necessarily then take place. He now, out of the proceeds of Mr. Cook's bets, pays two debts, at all events, of his own: one of 200*l*. to Herring, and the other of 450*l*. to Pratt. With regard to Padwick's debt, the 350*l*. I am told was a bet which Padwick had won partly from Palmer and partly from Mr. Cook, but for which Padwick will say he looked to Palmer. There is a letter of Palmer promising to pay the amount; and you will recollect Padwick had him in a position in which, at any moment, if he failed to keep on good terms with him,

he was in his power. Half of that 2000*l.* bill which had been discounted by Padwick as far back as 1854, upon a forged acceptance, was still unpaid; he had therefore an interest in pacifying Padwick and keeping him quiet; he was interested also in doing the same thing with regard to Pratt, and therefore he paid them those sums.

That is the state of things with regard to the disposition of the money realized for Mr. Cook at Tattersall's on the Monday. The way in which he desired it should be done was this: he desired Herring to send cheques to Pratt and Padwick, and he was so anxious about it that he begged him to send the cheques in the morning before he got to Tattersall's and had got in the amounts. Herring said, "No, I shall not do that, because I may not get the money." Palmer said, "It is all right, depend upon it you will get the money;" and, said he, "that money of Pratt's must be paid, because it is for a bill of sale on account of the mare,"—that is Polestar. That was not the fact; it was 450*l.* to be paid to Pratt to be written off the bill on which there was the forged acceptance, and on which Pratt had already issued the writs; and he had already engaged to pay it on the Saturday: we having now got to the following Monday. Palmer had two envelopes prepared, which he gave to Herring in which to send the cheques; however, the man refused to do that, or to pay until he had got the money. When this conversation had taken place, he then came to a settlement with Herring himself for some other small betting transactions. It seemed he owed Herring the ba-

lance of a betting transaction, 5*l.*, which he proposed to pay him; he produced a 50*l.* note, but Herring could not give him the entire change, and gave him a 20*l.* cheque. I will show you, gentlemen, what became of that cheque. After that he says to him, "When you have done all that, send down word to me what you have done." Herring said, "shall I send to you?" "Yes," he said, "to me or to Mr. Cook, it will be the same thing." Gentlemen, I shall prove to you before this case is over that the letters to Mr. Cook were intercepted, also through the instrumentality of Mr. Cheshire, the postmaster. Upon this Herring went to Tattersall's and got all the money, except a sum of 120*l.*, which a Mr. Morris paid short; he owed 200*l.*, and he paid 80*l.*, leaving 120*l.* still unpaid. In consequence of this he did not pay Padwick the 350*l.*, and wrote to Mr. Cook by that night's post to say so; but he paid the 450*l.* to Pratt. On that same day Palmer went to Pratt, paid him 20*l.* by the cheque of Herring which he had received from Herring, and 30*l.*, in notes, making 50*l.*, and he then drew up a memorandum applying those sums, together with 200*l.* which Mr. Fisher had advanced in consequence of the letter from Mr. Cook, upon the credit of the sums which Mr. Fisher would receive at Tattersall's, towards payment of his mother's acceptance due on the 25th of October, making altogether the sum of 1300*l.* So that you will see, gentlemen, by the payment of this 450*l.*, and the 50*l.*, making 500*l.*, and the 200*l.* which he had paid on the Saturday preceding, he stopped for a moment the pressure which was being put upon him by Mr. Pratt.

He promised to make further payment in a very short time, Mr. Pratt urging it was absolutely necessary the matter should not be allowed to sleep, as there was no chance of getting anything from the insurance office at that time; and he makes a promise that he will in a few days make further remittances. And he goes down on the Monday afternoon to Rugeley, after having effected this transaction in the course of the day.

He arrived at Rugeley on the Monday night about nine o'clock, and he proceeded to see Mr. Cook at the Talbot Arms, and from that hour until a late hour in the evening, ten or eleven o'clock, he was in and out of Mr. Cook's room. That night, after arriving at Rugeley, he went to a man of the name of Newton, the assistant of a surgeon there named Salt, and asked that man to give him some strychnia, and Newton gave him three grains of strychnia about nine o'clock, attaching no great importance to the fact of giving to a medical man a thing which is sometimes though rarely used in medical practice. Mr. Bamford had sent the same pills which he had given on the Saturday night and the Sunday night to the Talbot Arms to be taken by Mr. Cook, or rather he took them himself and left them with the housekeeper, by whom they were delivered to the maid, who took them up-stairs and put them in the usual place where the medicine was usually put to be administered by Palmer, for Palmer came in evening after evening and administered the medicine which Mr. Cook was to take. Palmer was in and out there, and there is no doubt Mr. Cook took pills; it will be for you to say whether he took the pills prepared

by Mr. Bamford, and which he had taken on the Saturday and Sunday night, or whether, as this accusation suggests, the prisoner substituted for the pills of Mr. Bamford some of his own concoction, in which strychnia was mixed. He left the man about eleven o'clock, or later than that, well and comfortable after the day; he had been considerably better from the morning; he was alone about twelve o'clock, when suddenly the women servants in the lower part of the house were alarmed by the most violent screams proceeding from Mr. Cook's room; they rushed upstairs, one of them went in, and they found him in a state of the greatest agony, screaming in the most fearful manner, shrieking murder, and calling upon Christ to save his soul; evidently in the most intense pain; he was convulsed; he could not keep his hands and arms quiet; he beat the bed convulsively with them, and his whole frame was in convulsions; all the time he was perfectly conscious; and begged Palmer might be sent for; one of the women ran across to fetch Palmer, who in a few minutes came; during the whole of the time the man's screams continued uninterruptedly, and the pain continued the same; he was beating the bed violently, rolling about convulsively in every direction, screaming, as I have already mentioned; his eyes were starting out of his head. After these violent convulsions had lasted a short time, his arms and legs became perfectly rigid, his mouth appeared closed, and he was gasping for breath, and could hardly speak for want of it. Palmer came and found him in this condition; then he ran across for medicine; the man's condition still remained on

his return the same. On his return Mr. Cook said, "Oh, dear! doctor, I shall die." "No, my lad," he said, "you will not;" and he proceeded to give him an opiate mixture and a couple of pills. I can hardly suppose this medicine had the effect of removing the symptoms; the medicine was vomited and the pills were not; they were looked for in the utensil into which he vomited, but were not found. Shortly after he became more tranquil, his arms were stiff, he called to the servants to rub them, they did so and found them cold; still by degrees these symptoms subsided, and the man became better.

Gentlemen, the medical men who will be called before you will tell you they have no doubt this was the tetanus of strychnia. The mode in which it showed itself coming on with the full violence of a paroxysm in the first instance, continuing as it did, is only to be ascribed in their opinion to strychnia taken in too infinite a quantity to take away life. I will make an observation presently on the inference which may be drawn from this state of things; I will not stop to do so at this moment. for we have more important events to deal with: enough that, for the moment, those symptoms abated; he became more tranquil; he seemed exhausted by what he had gone through, and nature asserted her claim to rest and repose, and he began to doze and sleep. Palmer stayed with him for some time, then left him, and went to his own house; and so things remained until the next day, Tuesday the 20th, the day of his death. On that morning Mr. Cook was found comparatively comfortable, although still retaining

the most intense and vivid impression of what he had gone through the night before; he conversed with the chambermaid on the subject of his condition; the prisoner saw Mr. Bamford, and told him he did not wish to have Mr. Cook disturbed, that he was better comparatively, and that he had had a fit the night before. That same morning, between half-past eleven and twelve o'clock, there occurred an incident to which I beg your particular attention. On that day the prisoner went to the shop of a Mr. Hawkins, a druggist at Rugeley; he had not dealt with Hawkins for two years before, for his former assistant, Thirlby, having set up as a chemist and druggist, Palmer had from that time dealt with him for the drugs and chemical compounds that he required. On this day he went to Hawkins's shop, and saw his assistant, a person of the name of Roberts; he produced a bill, and in the first place said he wanted two drachms of prussic acid. Whilst the prussic acid was being put up for him, a person of the name of Newton, the same man of whom, if you believe Newton, he had the strychnia the night before, came into the shop; on which the prisoner took him by the arm and said, "I have got something I want to say to you;" led him outside the door into the street, and began to talk to him about a very unimportant matter, namely, when his employer's son was about to go to the farm which he had recently taken in another part of the country; a matter in which, as far as we are aware, Palmer could have no possible interest. Having got Newton into the street, he stood in conversation with him until a person of the name of Bassington happened to

come up; the latter two entered into conversation, and drew off a little on one side. As soon as they were engaged in full conversation, Palmer came back into Hawkins's shop and desired the assistant to put him up six grains of strychnia and a certain quantity of Batley's liquor of opium, for which he produced another bill. While these things were being put up he stood in the doorway. Newton continued his conversation with Bassington, and did not come into the shop. When the things were ready the prisoner took them up, paid for them, and went away. Newton, who had come into the shop for some purpose, but who had been induced to go out of it by the prisoner drawing him out of it, came back, and being struck with the fact of Palmer coming there, out of the passing curiosity which sometimes suggests itself to one's mind, inquired what it was Palmer had come there for, and was informed. [The Attorney-General explained that there was a shade on the testimony of Newton, inasmuch as he had not mentioned the circumstance of his having given Palmer the strychnia until the day before the trial. The evidence of Roberts, however, gives a sufficient confirmation to his statement on this point.]

However, I now go on to the events of Tuesday, and I will call your attention to another remarkable circumstance. You will remember I told you Mr. Cook was entitled to receive the stakes which he had won at Shrewsbury; on the Tuesday Palmer sent for Cheshire, and desired Cheshire to bring a receipt-stamp with him. Cheshire, to whom Palmer owed a sum of 7*l.*, thought he was going to be paid that sum, and he came

with the stamp in his hand. Palmer produced a paper and desired him to draw a cheque on Messrs. Wetherby in his, Palmer's, favour for 350*l.*, making this curious observation: "Poor Cook is too ill to draw the cheque himself, and Messrs. Wetherby might know my handwriting." I can offer you no solution of that difficulty. Why, the cheque being drawn in his favour, there should be anything to apprehend from the circumstance of the body of the cheque being in his handwriting, I do not know; all I can say is that that passed, that he used that language to Cheshire, and Cheshire then copied on to a piece of paper the body of a cheque addressed to Messrs. Wetherby, whereby they were directed to pay the sum of 350*l.* to William Palmer, and place the same, as the language of the cheque ran, "to my account;" and he took that away to get Mr. Cook's signature. The cheque was sent that night to Messrs. Wetherby, and returned. Up to this moment the prosecution have not seen it, and whether it is Mr. Cook's signature or not, I cannot tell you. I shall call for its production when the proper time comes, and it will be for the prisoner to produce it or not as he shall be advised. If it is produced we shall be enabled immediately to ascertain whether it is a genuine signature of Mr. Cook or a forgery. [It was not produced.] But there is something which casts suspicion as to the honesty of the transaction from the fact of Palmer shrinking from putting his own handwriting in the body of that cheque. I shall hereafter follow out its history.

In the course of that morning coffee was again prepared, by

the desire of the prisoner, for Mr. Cook; broth was also sent by him; and the vomiting was renewed on the Tuesday, and continued throughout the whole afternoon. Now, on that afternoon a new person is introduced on the scene. On the Monday Palmer wrote to a person of the name of Jones, desiring him to come over to see Mr. Cook. Now, this is a remarkable part of the history of the case, and one which in every point of view is deserving of serious attention. Mr. Jones was a medical man living at Lutterworth, in whose house, when at home, Mr. Cook was in the habit of residing. On Sunday Palmer writes to Mr. Jones, stating that Mr. Cook was taken ill with a bilious attack accompanied with diarrhœa, and requesting him to come and see him as soon as possible. It may be the fact of his sending for a medical man may furnish the strongest inference of the prisoner's innocence; it is for you to say whether this fact, with one or two others of the same description, will operate on your minds in that way. I should not, however, be discharging my duty, if I did not suggest it as being part of a deep design, and that the administration of the irritant poison, of which abundant traces were found after death, was for the purpose of producing the appearance of natural disease, which could account afterwards for the death to which the victim was doomed. It is for you, gentlemen, to say which you think the fair and reasonable interpretation to put upon this act. In the letter, Palmer calls it a bilious attack attended with diarrhœa: the medical gentlemen who will be called, who saw the patient while these fits of vomiting lasted,

will tell you there were none of those appearances, and that it had the appearance of being produced by some irritant put into the stomach. Mr. Jones, being unwell, does not arrive until Tuesday about three o'clock, when he immediately proceeds to see his sick friend. Palmer came in, and they examined him together; and, having been told the man was suffering from a bilious complaint, the first thing Jones does is to look at the symptoms which might be expected under such circumstances, but he finds, as the preceding doctor had found, that the pulse was natural and slow, that there was no fever, and that the tongue was perfectly clean: he turned round to Palmer, and said, "That is hardly the tongue of a bilious patient;" on which Palmer said, "If you had seen it before, you would have seen what sort of a tongue it was." That evening, about seven o'clock, Mr. Bamford came as usual, when he found the patient progressing favourably, the sickness having abated. Mr. Bamford will tell you that in his view he showed some symptoms of excitement, the pulse had become more irritable, and had got up to between 80 and 90; but Mr. Jones explains that, by saying it was the presence of Mr. Bamford and the discussion as to the medicine which he was to take which caused that. Seeing the patient was somewhat irritable when the medicine came to be spoken of, the three medical men withdrew into the hall, into which the room opened, and held their consultation. I should tell you, before they went out Mr. Cook turned suddenly round to Palmer, and said, "Palmer, I will have no more medicine to-night—no more pills," making some reference to

the effects of the night before : on this the medical men withdrew. Palmer insisted on his taking the pills, as likely to be beneficial, and said, "they had better not tell him what they were going to give him, as he has an apprehension of their producing the same effect as they had last night." Accordingly, it was arranged that the pills should be made up, and that Mr. Cook should not know what they contained. Mr. Bamford went to his surgery accompanied by Palmer, and made up the pills as on the previous occasion. When he had made them up and put them into a box, Palmer asked him to write upon them the direction of how they were to be taken. This struck Mr. Bamford as being extraordinary, because, as Palmer himself was a medical man, and was going to give the pills to the patient, there could be no necessity for writing the direction ; but by Palmer's desire he did write the direction—"Pills to be taken at bedtime." He put the box into a paper and sealed it up. Three-quarters of an hour elapsed between the time the prisoner left Mr. Bamford's and came to Mr. Cook. When he did come he gave Mr. Cook two pills ; but before he gave them to Mr. Cook he opened the box, and called the attention of Mr. Jones to the direction, saying, alluding to Mr. Bamford's handwriting, "how wonderful it was that a man of eighty should write so good and strong a hand." Now, Mr. Jones did not know Mr. Bamford until that day. He had no particular interest about it, but the prisoner showed him this handwriting as indicating what a good hand Mr. Bamford wrote ; the effect being, as you will see, to identify the pill-box as having

come from Mr. Bamford, whereby any suspicion might be allayed which the future events might be calculated to produce. This was about half-past ten o'clock at night. The pills were then offered to Mr. Cook, who strongly objected to take them, saying, they made him ill the night before ; Palmer insisted, and Mr. Cook at last took them. He vomited immediately afterwards, but did not bring them up. After this Mr. Jones went down to get his supper, and it being arranged Mr. Jones should sleep there, about a little before twelve o'clock Mr. Jones came up from his supper to go to bed in the room. He undressed and went to bed. He will tell you that in the course of that evening Mr. Cook had been considerably better ; the vomiting had ceased, his spirits had returned, he had chatted with him cheerfully, spoken of his future plans, and, in short, there was nothing which indicated not only approaching death, but serious disease. Mr. Jones went to bed. When he had been in bed fifteen or twenty minutes, he was roused by a sudden exclamation and scream from Mr. Cook, who had started up, sitting on his bed as he had done the night before, and called out, "For God's sake fetch the doctor, I am going to be ill as I was last night." The chambermaid, who was called for, ran across to Palmer. In a moment Palmer came to the window. He was told he was wanted ; that Mr. Cook was ill ; and he said, "he would be down directly." He was across in less than two minutes, and he made the observation when he came that "he had never dressed so quickly in his life." It will be for you to say, gentlemen, when you have heard the statement, whether he could have had time

to dress. He found Mr. Cook manifesting the same symptoms he had shown the night before. He was sitting up gasping for breath, screaming violently, as he had done before; his body was convulsed, his neck began to stiffen, and he implored Mr. Jones to raise him up and rub his neck. Mr. Jones did so, and Palmer came. He implored Palmer to give him the same remedy as he had given him the night before, on which Palmer said, "I will go and fetch it." He came out and found the chambermaid and waitress in the inside hall, attracted by the noise of the screaming; on which Mills said, "Poor Mr. Cook is the same as last night." "No," said Palmer, "he is not a fiftieth part as bad as he was; what a game to be at every night!" Having made this observation, he went out, and almost immediately returned, and brought two pills with him, which he told Mr. Jones were ammonia. I am told, in the first place, that ammonia would not be a remedy in such a case; and, what is still more remarkable, that ammonia cannot very easily be put into pills. However, he gave him the pills, which immediately afterwards Mr. Cook threw up into the utensil which was given to him. Now, gentlemen, I beg to call your attention to the fact, that on both these nights he was enabled to swallow during the period of his convulsions, while the tetanus was upon him. You will find it to be an important fact where tetanus is produced by strychnia, lock-jaw—or, as the medical men call it, trismus—is occasionally a symptom, though not a necessary one, but it only comes in at the close of the paroxysms, and is perhaps the last of the tetanic rigor which affects

the muscles. The muscles of the throat and the jaw are the last affected. In the affection arising from a wound, lock-jaw is the first and most remarkable symptom. On both these occasions we find this man, while all the rest of his body was convulsed with cramps, capable of swallowing and vomiting, which a man with lock-jaw of course could not do. He swallowed those pills, brought them up again, and immediately afterwards was seized with the most violent convulsions, every muscle of his body was convulsed, and by degrees the body began to stiffen out. Of course, as soon as the body began to stiffen out, suffocation commenced. He violently entreated to be raised, as otherwise he should be suffocated. They tried to raise him, but it was impossible; the whole body had become so stiffened out with those fearful cramps, that it was impossible to move it from its position; it rested on the back of the head and heels, and from that position it could not be shifted. Finding they could not raise him, he said, "Pray turn me over." They did turn him over on his right side; he gasped for breath, but could do no more; in a few moments all seemed to be gradually ending in death. Mr. Jones leant over him and listened to the action of the heart; the pulse gradually subsided; all was over, and the man was dead; and the whole thing, from the beginning to the end, took less time in the action than it has taken me to tell you in the recital.

This was not idiopathic or traumatic tetanus, a case of hours,—but it was a case of minutes; from the time the first symptoms manifested themselves and the first

paroxysm took place, from that time till all was over did not occupy the space of ten minutes. Now the body of medical testimony which I shall produce before you will speak positively as to this being a death referable only from its symptoms and appearances to tetanus produced by strychnia, and not to the other forms to which I have already adverted.

[The Attorney-General then stated that immediately after Cook's death Palmer had been seen searching the pockets of his clothes, and under the pillow and bolster. The chambermaid, Elizabeth Mills, had seen his betting-book in Cook's hand on Monday, but it could not be found after his death. Neither that nor a single paper, nor any money, has ever been discovered. Afterwards, on the Thursday, Palmer came again, and said he wanted to get some books and a paper-knife which he had got from somebody in the town for the use of Mr. Cook, and which he should have to make good and pay for if not restored; the servant went to the housekeeper, got the key, and admitted Palmer into the room. In consequence of the servant saying she believed the housekeeper had the books, she was sent to inquire about them, and on her return she found him rummaging among Mr. Cook's things.] When I add to this what I shall prove to have happened at a subsequent period, it will be for you to say what has become of the betting-book, which I shall show to have been on Mr. Cook's dressing-table upon either the Monday or the Tuesday night, because one of the servants had it in her hand, and took from it a stamp which she gave him to put on a letter for the post—neither that book nor any

of his papers having been forthcoming.

Gentlemen, this ends the history of the day on which Mr. Cook died. I now pass on to the next day. On the Wednesday Messrs. Wetherby received the letter of Palmer inclosing the cheque which had been filled in by Cheshire on the Tuesday, and in which Palmer desired them to send him a cheque for the amount of the 350*l*. They replied that they had not sufficient funds. At that time the stakes had not been remitted to them from Shrewsbury. They also refused to pay to Mr. Pratt 75*l*. on account of this cheque.

Pratt, having failed to get the 75*l*. from Messrs. Wetherby, communicated with Palmer, and the latter person on the 24th comes up to London, saw Pratt, and pays him 100*l*. These are sums, recollect, paid by a man who, when he went to Shrewsbury races, had no money, and who lost there. The next day, Friday, he was again at Rugeley, and he again had recourse to Mr. Cheshire; he sent to Cheshire, and desired him to come to him. Cheshire came, and Palmer produced a paper which had Cook's signature to it, whether genuine or not I cannot pretend to say. That paper I shall call for, and when it is produced we shall be enabled to see whether the signature is genuine or not [It was not produced]; but this document so signed Palmer produced to Cheshire, and he asked Cheshire to attest its signature by Cook. Cheshire looked at the paper, which purported to be an acknowledgment by Cook that 4000*l*. worth of bills, the dates and circumstances of which were specified, were bills which had been negotiated by Palmer for Cook's benefit, and of which he,

Palmer, had received no share. As I said before, this may or may not have been a genuine document; the prisoner will be enabled to satisfy you on that point, by producing it when I call for it; but this is perfectly clear, to ask Cheshire to attest the signature of a man who had been forty-eight hours dead was on the face of it a fraud, and can convey to our minds nothing but an inference that there was some fraudulent transaction which the prisoner had in his mind when he attempted to carry out that purpose. Cheshire, though he had been the instrument of the prisoner, and under his influence to a lamentable extent, as will be proved, and for which he is now suffering, declined to do this act, and said, "Good God! the man is dead! I should not like to attest the signature of a man who is dead. If such a transaction should come out, and I should have to give evidence of it, I should not like the position." Palmer said, "Never mind, I dare say they will not dispute his signature; but I thought it would look better if it had an attesting witness to it;" and he took the paper away.

On the Friday Mr. Stephens, the step-father of Mr. Cook, came down; he was much attached to Cook, having married the widow of Mr. Cook's father. When he came he naturally went, in the first place, to see the corpse, and he was struck with the fulness of the face and the general appearance of the body; it had not the appearance of emaciation, which generally accompanies disease terminating in death. When he saw Palmer he inquired of him if he knew anything of Cook's affairs, as he had been on intimate terms

with him; on which Palmer stated, much to Mr. Stephens's surprise, that there were 4000*l.* worth of bills out with his name to them, and that he held a paper drawn up by a lawyer, and signed by Cook, whereby Cook acknowledged he was the only person primarily liable for those bills; and Palmer added that he should look to Cook's estate for them; on which Mr. Stephens said he was extremely surprised to hear of this: it was new to him, and all he could say was, there would not be 4000 shillings for the holders of the bills. Palmer said he hoped he should get the money; on which Mr. Stephens said, "If you do you will get it from the Court of Chancery, into which the affairs will be immediately carried." Mr. Stephens then spoke of the funeral, saying, he intended it to take place in London. Palmer expressed his willingness to conduct it, but Mr. Stephens declined the offer, stating it was his duty; but that inasmuch as he intended Cook to be buried in London, the body must remain at the hotel for two or three days. Palmer said that was of no consequence, but that it ought at once to be put in a coffin and fastened down. During some conversation between Mr. Stephens and Mr. Bamford, who was in the room, Palmer left, and returned in about half-an-hour. Stephens asked him if he could recommend some respectable undertaker, to whom he might give the necessary directions prior to the body being taken to London, on which Palmer said, "I have done that already; I have been out and ordered a shell and a strong oak coffin." At this Mr. Stephens expressed his surprise. Dinner having been in the mean time ordered, to which

Mr. Stephens had asked Mr. Jones and Mr. Bamford, he thought it a mere act of civility to ask Mr. Palmer to join them at dinner. Accordingly they dined together. After dinner, previous to Mr. Stephens leaving, turning to Jones he said, "It is time for me to go; will you be good enough to step up stairs and find me any books and papers belonging to my poor son-in-law? Collect them, and bring them down to me, that I may take them away." Jones left the room to go to the bedroom where the body lay, and Palmer followed him; they were absent ten minutes, and came back together. Jones then said in Palmer's presence, "I am sorry to say we can neither find his betting-book nor any papers." "Not find his betting-book?" said Mr. Stephens; "it must be found;" on which Palmer interposed, and said, "It would be of no use to you if you could find it; the bets would be void by his death:"—the fact being, as you know, gentlemen, that they had been received and devoted to Palmer's purposes. "I do not care for that," said Mr. Stephens, "the book must and shall be found;" on which Palmer, somewhat changing his tone, said, "I have no doubt it will be found." Mr. Stephens on this rang the bell, and when the housekeeper came desired her immediately to go and take possession of whatever there might be of Mr. Cook's, to lock the door, and allow no one to have access to the place until his return from London, where he had made up his mind to go to obtain the assistance of a solicitor. Before leaving he went to take a farewell view of the body of his deceased step-son, and on taking the hands of the deceased man, to his

astonishment found them firmly clenched, instead of the muscles being relaxed, as they usually are in death. He said nothing, but immediately left for London with his mind strongly impressed with the circumstances and facts I have detailed. [Having consulted a solicitor, Mr. Stephens returned to Rugeley. At the Wolverton station, to his great surprise, he saw Palmer, who was travelling by the same train. In a conversation which ensued, Mr. Stephens stated his intention to have a *post-mortem* examination of Cook's body. Palmer endeavoured to recommend a solicitor to conduct the inquiry, and also to ascertain who was to make the *post-mortem* examination. Palmer, in fact, had hurried up to London to pay Pratt the 100*l.*, and to give him a caution (afterwards repeated in a letter) not to give any one information on Cook's affairs.]

Shortly after this the circumstances became bruited abroad, then came the final crisis. Mr. Padwick, who had a warrant of attorney, arrested Palmer, and brought an action against his mother on the acceptances, and then everything became known, as might have been anticipated. Continuing the narrative: on Sunday the 25th the prisoner went to Mr. Bamford and asked for a certificate of the cause of Cook's death. Mr. Bamford said, "Why should you ask me for it? he was your patient." "No," said Palmer, "I would rather you gave the certificate." It was discussed what the certificate should be, and finally it was entered "apoplexy." I am told, gentlemen, Mr. Bamford is upwards of 80 years of age, though he still continues to practise. I hope that infirmity may have been the cause of

his doing that which certainly at the present moment he cannot attempt to justify. Mr. Bamford will not tell you that apoplexy ever caused tetanus in this world; he will tell you most likely that, in his opinion, the man died of tetanus; but the *post-mortem* examination will show there is no pretence for saying he died from apoplexy. During the same Sunday the prisoner sent for Newton, the assistant of Mr. Salt, and got into conversation with him; after a time Palmer turned it to the subject of strychnia, and asked, "How much strychnia should you give if you wanted to kill a dog?" on which Newton said, "From half a grain to a grain." "What appearances should you expect to find in the stomach or intestines after death?" "None," said Newton; "it does not cause inflammation, or leave any appearance." Mr. Newton will tell you, on that an exclamation of satisfaction escaped from the prisoner's lips. This was on the Sunday evening, when the *post-mortem* examination was to take place the next day. And it did take place the next day, in the presence of several medical men; among others was a Dr. Harland, who came from Stafford. That gentleman on his arrival met Palmer, whom he knew as a medical man, and said, "What is this case? I hear there is a suspicion of poisoning." "Oh! no," said Palmer; "he had epileptic fits on the Monday and Tuesday nights, and you will find old disease, both of the heart and head." They then went on to Mr. Bamford's, where the other medical men were assembled, and Palmer makes this observation—"Here is a queer old man, Cook's father-in-law, making inquiries, and his conduct to me is very strange; I do not know what

he wants." Among the medical gentlemen present was Mr. Newton; and as they were leaving Mr. Bamford's, Palmer said, "This will be a dirty job; I will go and get a drop of brandy,"—at the same time saying to him, "The poor fellow was full of disease; his throat was diseased, and he had syphilis." So that you see, gentlemen, he varies again and again his account of the complaints under which Mr. Cook was suffering.

I now come to the *post-mortem* examination: that was made by a person of the name of Devonshire, a young medical practitioner, in the presence of Dr. Harland, Mr. Arnold, Mr. Monkton, Mr. Bamford, Mr. Newton, and the prisoner Palmer. The body was carefully examined: it presented the external appearance of death by tetanus; the muscles were all bent into a state of undue rigidity; the feet distorted, so as to bear the appearance of the man having been club-footed; the hands closed so firmly, that it required force to open them, when they closed again; and the head bent backwards. They then proceeded to open the body, and to examine all the important parts connected with the vital system of man; they examined the abdomen and liver, and found them healthy; they examined the lungs and the kidneys; it is said there was a slight congestion of the latter. The medical men are not agreed as to whether that is due to anything in the form of disease, or to the derangement which takes place after death; but they are all agreed on this, that there was nothing at all to disturb the functional healthiness of the system, or in the slightest degree to account for death. They examined the stomach and the intestines, and the only things

they found were a few white spots at the large end of the stomach, which they say might possibly cause a small amount of derangement, but which could not in the slightest degree be spoken of as the cause of death. They examined also that most important organ the brain, and they found it quite healthy.

I should tell you, gentlemen, here, that in the following January the body was exhumed for the purpose of a further examination being made into the state of the spinal cord and marrow, when they were found in a most healthy condition, without the slightest appearance of anything to which death could be attributable, and it is a remarkable fact that even when taken up in January, though the muscles of the trunk had lost their rigidity, the muscles of the hands, fingers, legs, feet, and toes all maintained the same remarkable appearances which manifested themselves immediately after death.

Gentlemen, I go back to the *post-mortem* examination which took place on the Monday. The stomach and intestines were carefully examined, and no trace of disease was found: there was no inflammation. The prisoner's attention was directed to that, and when he saw that it presented no appearances at all indicative of any inflammation or injury to those parts, he turned round to Mr. Bamford and used more than once the remarkable expression, "Doctor, they won't hang us yet." The stomach and intestines were taken from the body and opened over a jar. Mr. Devonshire, who is a young practitioner, does not appear to have conducted the affair in the most careful manner: he ruptured the stomach, and was obliged to tie it up at both ends with a string; it was turned

inside out, and the stomach was thrown into the mass of matter which came from it, and was found in the jar. While this was being done, Dr. Harland will tell you, the prisoner, who was standing behind Mr. Newton and Mr. Bamford, very unnecessarily pushed against them, so much so as to call for remonstrance from Dr. Harland. The jar was then with its contents covered with parchment, tied down by Dr. Harland, and sealed. It was then put on one side while the medical men turned their attention to the rest of the examination. After a minute Dr. Harland happened to turn round and saw the jar was gone; he immediately called out, "Where is the jar?" On this, everybody's attention being directed round the room, at a distance, at a door not properly leading from the room, stood the prisoner with it; he said, "I have it; I thought it might be more convenient to put it there, that you might have it at hand when you went out." That was a way out, but it was not the usual way; on which they immediately called out, "Pray, bring it back." It was brought back, and Dr. Harland and the other gentlemen immediately saw two slits had been cut through the double skin with a knife—it had been, mind, in nobody's hands but his. I am bound to say, gentlemen, whatever had been his intention, he had not carried it out so far as to be able to get anything from the jar. The slits cut by the knife were clean; nothing had come out of it; still it is a circumstance which I am bound to call your attention to, that the jar was found in the prisoner's hands in a position in which in another minute it might have been out of the room, and two slits had been cut in the parchment

which were not there at the time the jar was tied up.

After that the prisoner is very anxious as to what is to be done with the jar. Finding Dr. Harland, who is a most respectable man, a magistrate of the county, was about to take it away, he remonstrates with Mr. Bamford against its removal; he says, "I do not think we ought to let them take away that jar; who knows what they may put into it?" If this had been said by an ignorant uneducated man, not familiar with the course of conduct pursued by medical men, there might have been less in that; but taking it as it is, it is for you to say whether this anxiety to stop the jar being removed is not an indication of a guilty conscience on the part of the prisoner. But, gentlemen, it does not stop there; the jar is taken to Mr. Freer, a surgeon at Rugeley. Having been sealed, it is delivered to Mr. Boycott in a condition in which it could not be tampered with, for it was not only tied down but sealed, and any interference with it could be discovered. Notwithstanding that, the prisoner was in the highest state of anxiety that this jar should not reach its destination. He finds out that it is going to be conveyed to London for the purpose of chemical analysis, and that Mr. Stephens and Mr. Boycott, Mr. Gardiner's clerk, are going away that night by post-chaise to Colwich, there to take the train for London; the fly was to be driven by a postboy from the Talbot, of the name of Myatt. Palmer goes to him, and asks him if it is the fact that he was going to drive over Mr. Stephens and Mr. Boycott that night? on being answered in the affirmative, he says, "I am told they are going to take the jar

with them; they have no business to take it: I do not know what they may put into it. Could you not manage to upset the fly and break the jar? I will give you 10*l.* to do it." The man said, "I could not think of such a thing." Says he, "I will make it all right with you if you will." The man said, "I will do no such thing, and I must go and look after my fly," and so left him. That man is a respectable man; and, as far as I know, he can have no earthly motive for stating such a fact if it be untrue. If it be true, and you believe it, it will be for you to say whether there can be any but one inference that can be drawn from such a fact as that.

I mentioned to you that the prisoner had had no money previous to the Shrewsbury races, and that he lost money there. I shall show you that after that he was flush of cash: he paid 100*l.* or 150*l.* into the bank where he banked at Rugeley, and he paid sums of 50*l.* each to two or three persons in that neighbourhood; he was dealing with money right and left. I shall trace to his possession something like 400*l.* Cook had 700*l.* or 800*l.* on the Thursday morning when he left Shrewsbury; none is found. It may be, and I do not say it is not so, that Cook, who I believe was a compassionate, kind-hearted creature—whatever faults or follies he may have been led into—compassionating the position in which Palmer was, may have assisted him with money. I do not know how that fact is, but I do not wish to strain the thing too far against the prisoner. On the other hand, I think no one can imagine that Mr. Cook, who had nothing to look to except the money he had won at Shrewsbury,

and who was looking to that as the means of carrying him through the winter to the next year, should have given up everything to this man. The money he took with him to Shrewsbury, the proceeds of the bets, amounting to 1000*l.*, at Tattersall's; the stakes, amounting to 380*l.*, he was to receive from Messrs. Wetherby: it seems impossible to suppose the man would have denuded himself of everything, and left himself destitute for the coming winter, for the assistance of Palmer. The case then stands thus. You have a man overwhelmed with pecuniary liabilities, who has resorted to the desperate expedient of forging acceptances on which to raise money; who hoped to meet those acceptances by the proceeds of an insurance made on a very doubtful life; who is disappointed of that expectation, by the company in which the life was insured refusing or delaying payment; and then he is told by the agent, through whom these bills had been discounted, "You must trifle with me no longer, you must find money, because these policies have ceased to be an available security except between you and your mother. I must issue writs; I will abstain from serving them for a few days, but, mark! if you do not find me money within a given period, these writs will be served." The man has ruin staring him in the face, not merely pecuniary ruin, but all the punishments which attach to the crime of forgery, of which he knew himself to be guilty. He had forged Mr. Cook's name for 375*l.*; and I will show, in another instance, having forged the acceptance of his mother, he got it discounted, and got Mr. Cook to put his endorsement on the

back of that bill, so that Mr. Cook would have been liable thereupon.

Gentlemen, it is for you to say, under these circumstances, whether the prospect of getting the 1000*l.* of the bets would not be a sufficient inducement to lead him to commit this offence. But he seems to have had another object in view. No sooner is the breath out of the dead man's body than he says to Mr. Jones, "I have a claim against him for 3000*l.* or 4000*l.* on bills I have put my name to for his accommodation." He tells the same story to the father-in-law and to Mr. Pratt, and he produces that document to prove it, which he asks Cheshire to attest the signature to after the death of the man who is supposed to have sent it. I do not wish to press the matter further than I legitimately ought; but the fact of Mr. Cook having been mixed up in that strange insurance of Mr. Bates would lead one, perhaps, to the surmise that Mr. Cook was in possession of secrets relating to the desperate expedients to which this man had resorted for the purpose of obtaining money. It is for you to say, whether this combination of motive may have led to the perpetration of this crime; but I say that easily arises, supposing the case is balanced between probabilities which weigh on the one side or the other. If you believe the evidence, that on the Monday night he purchased strychnine, that on the Tuesday morning he again bought this article; if you believe the paroxysm of the Monday night and the mortal agony of the Tuesday night were the result, as medical men will tell you, of strychnine administered to him; then I show that on the Tuesday the pills were administered

by the hands of Palmer, and on the Monday also, by a degree of probability that amounts almost to certainty: if that be so, we need not speculate on motive; what is there to be set against it? You will be told, and told with truth, no strychnine was found. The stomach and intestines were submitted to a careful and searching analysis, and I am bound to say no trace of strychnine was discovered; but I am told by high authority that although the presence of strychnine may be discovered by certain tests, and although the indication of its presence would lead irresistibly to the conclusion of its having been administered, the converse of the proposition does not hold; it is found sometimes, at other times it is not: it depends on circumstances. You have heard, and it will be proved to you, that a most minute dose will destroy life—from half a grain to three quarters will lay the strongest man prostrate in the pains of death; but in order that it shall produce these fatal effects, it must be absorbed into the system. The absorption takes place in a greater or less amount of time, according to the manner in which the poison is presented to the absorbents; if it is presented in a fluid form, it is rapidly taken up, and produces its effects rapidly; if it is administered in the form of pills, as the pill must first be dissolved, and when dissolved, it presents itself only to the action of the absorbent vessels, the effects will require a little time before they present themselves; and as the poison is a vegetable poison, the tests which can be applied for its detection are infinitely more delicate and more difficult of application. It is not like a mineral poison, which may be

easily detected and reproduced in specie; that is not the case with a vegetable poison; there are, therefore, difficulties accompanying the detection of its presence. If the dose has been a large one, there is clearly no difficulty whatever; it kills with so great a facility, that before the whole has been absorbed into the system, a paroxysm arises and death ensues. A portion is left in the intestines, which is found hereafter. If the minimum is applied, the contrary is the case, and experience shows the theory I am enunciating is borne out by facts. Experiments have been tried, which will be brought before you, which show, where the same amount of the poison has been administered to animals of the same species, in which the tenacity of life may be supposed to be equal, death will arise in the same number of minutes in the same form, and when the analysis is afterwards made the presence of the poison will be discovered in the one, but cannot be made manifest in the other.

Gentlemen, it is for you to say in this case, when you shall have heard the whole body of testimony I will lay before you, whether the circumstances do not unerringly lead your minds to the conclusion that the deceased man, whose death is the subject-matter of this inquiry, came to his death by the administration of that poison, and that it was administered to him by the hands of the prisoner. There is one circumstance to which I must advert before I sit down, and it is for you to say whether it does not throw a great light on what would otherwise be involved in darkness. From the Wednesday until the ensuing Tuesday, with the absence of a part of Monday, the deceased was in a continued state

of retching and vomiting; the analysis made of his body since his death has failed to produce evidence of the presence of strychnine, but it has not failed to produce evidence of the presence of antimony. The antimony has been reproduced in specie, and will be laid before you. Who administered that antimony? How did it get into his system? It was not administered by any of the three medical men who were called in. It was not administered by Dr. Savage. The man never took antimony with the knowledge of any medical man that attended him, unless it was with the knowledge of the prisoner. Unless taken in a considerable quantity it produces no effect on the throat; it is soluble, the liquid in which it is dissolved does not indicate its presence. It was in that man's body; how did it get there? It is an irritant which produces sickness of the form under which Mr. Cook suffered. It is administered in medicine for that purpose. This man is sick for a week, and antimony is found in his body afterwards. Who could have administered it? For what purpose was it administered? There again one is lost in speculation; it may have been originally he intended to destroy him with it. It may have been his only object was to bring on the appearance of disease, to enable him to call for a medical man, and account for the death when it took place. So also with regard to the first dose of strychnine. It may have been weak on purpose, or by accident. I am told it is sometimes sold in a diluted form, being only the sixth part of the strength of strychnine. He may not have intended to dispose of him that night. The question is, whether strychnine was

administered on the Monday night, and still more on the Tuesday, when the death took place. If you are satisfied it was, then remains the question whether it was by the prisoner's hands the strychnine was administered. I shall produce the testimony before you to which I have adverted, and which, I fear, must occupy some considerable portion of your time, but in such an inquiry time cannot be wasted. I am sure that you will give it all your most patient attention. I have the satisfaction of knowing that the prisoner will be defended by one of the most able and eminent men that ever adorned the Bar of England. If in the end, the evidence fail to satisfy you of his guilt, or if the explanation offered satisfy you of his innocence, in God's name, let not an innocent man—one who is not proved to be guilty—suffer. If, on the other hand, the facts to which I have already adverted, and which I shall lay before you in evidence, lead you to the conclusion he is guilty, the best interests of society and the duty you owe to society and yourselves will demand at your hands a verdict of guilty.

Mr. Ishmael Fisher.—On the night of Wednesday did you go into that sitting-room (at the Raven, Shrewsbury), in which Mr. Cook, the deceased, and Mr. Palmer were? Yes.—About what hour? Between 11 and 12.—Whom did you find in the room when you went in?—I found Mr. Cook, Mr. Palmer, and Mr. Myatt; they were the only persons I saw there.—What were they doing when you went into the room? They appeared to have some grog before them each.—Did you observe that Mr. Cook had some brandy-and-

water in a glass by him, or grog, as you call it? Yes.—Do you remember Palmer saying anything to Cook in your presence about having some more brandy-and-water? Mr. Cook asked him to have some more.—Mr. Cook asked Mr. Palmer to have some more? Yes.—What did Palmer say to that? “I shall not have any more till you have drunk yours.”—What did Cook say then? He said, “I will drink mine.”—What did he do? He took up his glass and drank it at a draught, or he might have made two draughts of it; at all events, he drank it off immediately.—After he had drunk it did he do anything, or make any observation? Yes, he said, “There is something in it.”—What more did he say? “It burns my throat dreadfully,” he said.—Upon that did Palmer do anything; did Palmer hear him say that? Yes.—What did Palmer do; did he do anything? Mr. Palmer got up and took up the glass.—What did he do? He sipped up what was left in the glass, and he said, “There is nothing in it.”—Did you observe what there was? what quantity of liquor do you think was left in the glass when Palmer took it up and said, “There is nothing in it?” what quantity had been left by Cook? I should think certainly not more than a teaspoonful.—After Palmer had, as you say, put the glass to his mouth, and said, “There is nothing in it,” did he do anything with the glass to yourself and Read (who had just entered)? Palmer handed the glass to Read, and asked him if he thought there was anything in it.—Did he do anything to you? did he put the glass to you at all? Yes, it was handed to me also.—When Palmer handed the glass to

yourself and Mr. Read what did you do? We each said, the glass being so empty, we could not recognise anything.—Did you observe anything at all about the glass? I said I thought there was rather a strong scent upon it.—Did you add anything to that? No, only I could not detect anything besides brandy; I could not say there was anything besides brandy.—Did you put it to your lips? No.—How could you give any opinion about it? By the smell.—Shortly, after this did Cook retire from the room? He did. He left the room, and came back and called me.—I believe you went with him into his sitting-room? Into my own sitting-room.—What state was Mr. Cook in then? He was very ill; he had been very sick: he told me he had been very ill and very sick, and asked me to take his money. He said he had been very sick, and he thought that damned Palmer had dosed him.—You say upon that occasion he handed you over some money? Yes.—How much money did he give you? It was over 700*l.*; I cannot exactly remember; between 700*l.* and 800*l.*—The next morning did you see Palmer? Yes, about 10 o'clock.—Where did you see him? In my own sitting-room.—Did Palmer say anything to you about Mr. Cook when you found him in your room that morning? Yes.—What did he say? He said that Cook had been stating he had given him something last night; that he had been putting something in his brandy, or something to that effect.—What else did he say? He never played such tricks with people: “I never play such tricks with people,” he said.—Did he say anything about his being

drunk? Yes, he said, "I can tell you what he was; he was damned drunk."—Palmer said so? Yes.—Was he drunk? No; I should say certainly not.

Fisher's evidence as to the brandy-and-water was corroborated in every respect by Read and Myatt.

Elizabeth Mills.—Were you the chambermaid at the Talbot Arms at Rugeley in November last? Yes.—Upon this Sunday was any more broth brought over? Yes.—About what quantity should you say? A large breakfast-cup.—Who brought it to the Talbot Arms? Charles Horley, I believe; I did not see him, but I heard that he had brought it.—However, it was not made at the Talbot Arms; of that you are quite sure? It was not made at the Talbot Arms.—Did you take any of it up to Mr. Cook's room? Yes.—In the same cup in which it was brought? Yes.—Was it brought hot, then, ready for drinking? Yes.—And you took it up to Cook's bedroom in the same cup in which it had been brought? Exactly as it came over.—Did you taste any of that? Yes.—Before you took it up to Mr. Cook's room? Yes.—How much do you suppose you drank? About two table-spoonfuls.—You must describe exactly what the effect of that was upon you; were you sick? Yes.—How soon after you had taken it were you sick? In about half an hour, or it might be more; it was not more than an hour.

Lord Campbell.—Did you vomit? Yes.

By Mr. James.—How frequently? All the afternoon, till about five o'clock.—Violently? Violently.—Were you obliged to retire to your bedroom? Yes.—And go to bed? Yes.

Lord Campbell.—You were obliged to go to bed? Yes.

By Mr. James.—Did you vomit many times? A great many times.—Up to that time had you been quite well? were you quite well at that time when you took the broth? Yes; I felt perfectly well during the morning. * * * * You retired to rest (*on Monday night*)? Yes.—About what time? Between 10 and 11.—Did the waitress, Lavinia Barnes, call you up? Yes.—About what time was it that you were called up? It might be a quarter or ten minutes before 12; I did not look, but I should fancy, from the time when the clock struck, that it would be that.—Did you hear any screaming? Yes, violent screaming. Whilst I was dressing I heard him scream violently.—Did those screams come from Cook's room? Yes.—More than once? Twice.—Is your room over his? No.—And you heard the screams in your room? Yes.—Did you go down to his room? Yes.—Did you enter Cook's room? Yes.—Describe what you first saw, what he said to you, and what you saw; what was he doing? As soon as I entered the room I found him sitting up in bed; he desired me to fetch Mr. Palmer directly. I told him Mr. Palmer was sent for, and walked to his bedside.

Mr. Baron Alderson.—You walked to his bedside? Yes.—What was he doing when you went to the bed; what did you observe? He was beating the bedclothes.—In what manner? Like this, with his arms and hands (*describing it*).

Lord Campbell.—With both his hands? With both his hands and arms stretched out.

By Mr. James.—Stretched out? Like this.—Were his arms stretched out? They were, in this form.

—I think you said stretched out? Yes.—Having picked the pillow up, you asked him to lay his head down? Yes.—What did he do then? He said, “I cannot lie down. I shall suffocate if I lie. Oh, fetch Mr. Palmer!” very loud he called.—Did you observe his legs at all? No, not then.—Did you observe his arms? His body, his head and neck were moving then; a sort of jumping or jerking.—Was his head back at all? His head was back; sometimes he would throw back his head upon the pillow, and then he would raise himself up again.—Where was this jumping or jerking; in his head? All over his body.—Did you observe any difficulty about his breathing? Yes, very bad.—Did you observe anything about his mouth or his eyes? Yes; the ball of the eyes very much projected.

Lord Campbell.—Of both eyes? Yes.

By Mr. James.—Did you observe any gasping when he spoke? Yes, it was difficult for him to speak, he was so short of breath.—Did he scream again while you were in the room? Yes, three or four times.—Was that while he was doing this? Yes; he was moving and knocking about all the time.—Did he give utterance to any words in his screaming, or was it a mere convulsive scream,¹ or what was it? He called aloud “Murder” twice.—After the beating had gone on with his hands and arms, as you have described, did you observe any stiffness about his arms or hands? He asked me to rub one hand. * * * * (*Tuesday*).—Did he say anything of his sufferings the previous night? He asked me if I had ever seen any one suffer, or any one in such agony as he was last night? I said

no, I never had.—Did he describe any more what it was? He said he should think I would not wish to see any one ever like that again.—Did he say how it happened, or what caused it? I asked him. I said, “What do you think was the cause of all that, Mr. Cook?” and he said, “The pills that Palmer gave me at half-past 10.”—Mr. Palmer said to Mr. Cook, “Can this good girl do anything more for you to-night (*Tuesday night*)?” Mr. Cook said, “No; I shall want nothing more; good night.” That was as late as half-past 10.—Was that said by Mr. Cook in a composed and comfortable manner? Yes.—I believe you did not go to bed that night? No.—Where did you remain? In the kitchen.—You were anxious probably to see how Mr. Cook went on? Yes, I was.—While you were in the kitchen, was the bell of Mr. Cook’s room rung? Yes.—Violently? Violently.

Lord Campbell.—Were you asleep at that time? No.

Mr. James.—About what time? A little before 12; ten minutes, perhaps, before 12.—It was as near as possible the same time as on the previous night? Yes, it was.—Mr. Jones was sleeping in his bedroom? Yes.—Did you go up-stairs to Mr. Cook’s room on hearing the bell? Yes.—In what state did you find Mr. Cook? I believe he was sitting up in bed; Mr. Jones appeared to be supporting him; I think he had his arm round his shoulder. Mr. Cook said, “Oh, Mary, fetch Mr. Palmer directly.”—Cook was conscious then? Yes.—He spoke to you and knew you? Yes.—What did you do? I went over for Mr. Palmer; I rang the bell, the surgery-bell at the surgery door; Palmer

came to the bedroom window.—How soon did Palmer come to the bedroom window after you rang the bell? As soon as I stepped off the step into the middle of the road; I expected him to come to the window, and as soon as I stepped off into the road he was there; he did not put up the sash.—What did you say to him? I asked him to come over to Mr. Cook directly; that he was much the same as he was the night before.—How soon after did Palmer come? Two or three minutes.—Were you in the bedroom when Palmer came? Yes.—When Palmer came in, did he make any observation about dressing? He never dressed so quick in his life, I think he said.

* * * Did you hear Mr. Cook make any request about being turned over? I believe I did; yes.—What did he say? I believe it was, “Turn me over on my right side;” I believe it was “my right side.”—To whom did he say that? who was in attendance upon him at that time? I was not in the room at that time; I was at the door.

* * * You said you were never asked before the coroner to describe all the symptoms you saw? No.—You say the coroner did not ask you to make any full statement of the symptoms and all you saw, but put the questions to you? Yes.

Lord Campbell.—Did he ask what effect the broth had on you? The coroner asked me if the broth had any effect on me, and I said not that I was aware of.

Mr. Baron Alderson.—That is not down.

By Mr. Serjeant Shee.—What brought to your mind afterwards the vomiting after taking the broth? just explain it to the Judge and jury. I do not know; I be-

lieve it was some one else in the house that mentioned my sickness first.—It did not occur to you; you believe some one else mentioned it? Yes; I believe some one else mentioned it first.

Lord Campbell.—When? Perhaps a week after the coroner was there.

By Mr. James.—You must not state what that person said; but who was it? I cannot remember who it was, but it was some of my fellow-servants in the house.—Is it the fact you were vomiting after taking the broth? Yes.—And that you went to bed? Yes.—Does Lavinia Barnes know that? Yes. (The fact of this sickness was distinctly corroborated by Lavinia Barnes.)

Mrs. Anne Brooks sworn.—You went on to the Raven, and your friends waited down-stairs; did you go up? Yes, I went up.

Lord Campbell.—Up to the first floor? Yes, a servant was going up at the moment; I went and asked her to be good enough to tell Palmer I wanted to see him.

By the Attorney-General.—When you get to the top of the stairs, is there a lobby or passage there? Yes, there is one facing, and the other to the left. When you got to the top of the stairs, which way did you turn? To the left.—Did you at that time know which room Palmer was occupying? Yes, I had called frequently at the Raven Hotel.—Had you called there before during the races? I had called the evening before, but he had gone off to Rugeley.—You say you turned to the left of the passage which went off to the left? The servant called my attention by saying, “He is there, ma’am.”—Did the servant point to his room or to himself? Just moved

her head; she had a tray in her hand; she said, "He is here, ma'am."—Was he there; did you see him personally? Yes.—Where was Palmer at that time? He was standing at a small table.—In the passage, or in the room? In the passage.—Did you observe whether he was doing anything? what was he doing? He had a tumbler glass, something similar to that (*pointing to a tumbler*).—What was he doing with the tumbler glass? He had it in his hand when I saw him first.—Could you see whether there was anything in it? There appeared to be a small quantity of water in it; liquid it was, of the colour of water.—You do not mean it was water coloured, but a liquid of the colour of water? Yes.—Did you see him do anything with this glass, or with the water in it, or what appeared to be water? I did not see him put anything in it.—He had the tumbler in his hand? Yes.—Did he do anything with the tumbler? He turned it in this manner, round.—Do you mean shaking the fluid up that was in it? Yes.—Was there a light in the passage? Yes, there was a light where I stood. Mr. Palmer was in the shade.—Was there any light near him? The light was nearer to me.—You say he was shaking the fluid up that was in the tumbler; did you see him do anything with the tumbler? He said, "I will be with you presently," and he held it up just in that form, as if he were looking at the light.—And then he made an observation to you? Yes.—What did he say? He said, "I will be with you presently."—When did he first see you? could you tell that? He noticed me the moment I got to the top of the stairs.—After he

had said, "I will be with you presently," where did he go? He stood a few minutes longer, perhaps a minute or two longer, at the table.—What was he doing during that minute or two? He had the glass in his hand.—Was that before he held it up to the light, or afterwards? He held it up once or twice during the time he stood there.—In the intervals between the time when he held it first, and held it up afterwards, did he hold it still or continue to shake it? I did not observe him all the while, but I did observe him shaking it now and then.—While he was standing there, shaking the glass now and then, and holding it up to the light, did any conversation between you take place? He made an observation about the weather; what very fine weather we had.—Was the weather fine? It was.—After this, what became of him? There was a sitting-room, partially open, adjoining Palmer's sitting-room, and he carried the glass into the sitting-room.

Lavinia Barnes sworn.—In November, 1855, were you in service at the Talbot Arms? Yes.—What were you there, in what capacity? Waitress.—On the Sunday do you remember some more broth being sent over? I did not see it.—Do you remember whether Elizabeth Mills was taken ill on the Sunday, or not? Yes, she was.—About what time, do you remember? Between 12 and 1, I think.—Where did she go to from her work? She went to bed.—Did you see her vomiting yourself? Yes.—Was it violent? Yes.—How long did she remain ill before she came back to her work? I think it was between 4 and 5 when she came down again.—Did

she complain to you at the time of having been ill from the vomiting? Yes; she said she felt very sick. * * * At about 12 o'clock (*on Monday night*) were you alarmed by anything? Yes.—Where were you then? In the kitchen.—You had not been to bed? No.

Mr. William Henry Jones, surgeon, of Lutterworth, after detailing the administration of the pills on Tuesday night.—Search was made in the utensil for what? For the pills.—To see whether they had been brought off? Whether they had been returned.—By both Palmer and you? Yes, at his request.—At Palmer's request? Yes.—Did you find the pills? I found nothing but the toast-and-water.—So that the pills had been retained? The pills had been retained.—Did he take the pills in the toast-and-water, or did he take the toast-and-water afterwards? He took them without anything.—When had he drunk the toast-and-water? It must have been previously: I do not know when.—What he brought off was toast-and-water? Yes.—And there were no pills in the toast-and-water? There were not; he had toast-and-water by his bed-side.—As a medical man, should you say that the contents of the pills could have caused vomiting? Certainly not.—It came so quickly afterwards? Certainly.—The act of swallowing possibly might have done so? I should think not.—After he had vomited, what did he do? He lay down very comfortably, and we left him.—Did he appear quiet after that? Yes, quite.—You said that he seemed better before that; had he become stronger than he was when you first arrived? He expressed himself as stronger.—Had he got

up? Yes, he got out of his bed.—And sat in a chair? And sat in a chair.—That was before Mr. Palmer came and gave him those pills? Yes.—Was that between the time you went over with Palmer to his house and the time Palmer came with the pills, or was it earlier than that he got up and sat in the chair? I can hardly recollect.—How was he in point of spirits that evening? His spirits were very good; he was very jocose.—He was laughing and joking? Yes; speaking of what he should do during the winter; he spoke of hunting.—He spoke of his future plans and projects? Yes.—After he had taken those two pills which Palmer brought at 11 o'clock, did you remain in the room with him, or did you go down-stairs? I went down-stairs to have some supper.—Had it been arranged that you should sleep in his room that night? At his request.—It was a double-bedded room? A double-bedded room.—Did you go to bed after you went up-stairs? Yes.—How soon after you got up-stairs? I talked to him a few minutes, and then went to bed.—At the time you last talked to him before you got into bed, how did he then appear to be? Rather sleepy, but quite as well as usual.—There was nothing about him at that time to excite any apprehension in your mind? Nothing at all.—After you went to bed, were you disturbed by him? I had been in bed ten minutes, according to my impression.—What happened then? He suddenly raised himself up in bed.—Tell us what happened? He suddenly started up in bed, and called out these words: "Doctor, get up; I am going to be ill; ring the bell for Mr. Palmer;" I rang the

bell.—Who came? The chambermaid came to the door, and he himself called out, “Fetch Mr. Palmer.”—Called out to her? Yes, to her.—Did he say anything to you? He asked me to rub his neck.—Before that had he asked you for anything? He asked me to give him something: I said I had nothing with me.

Lord Campbell. — Something to relieve him he meant? Yes; I said, “I have nothing with me; Mr. Palmer will be here directly.”—In what position was he? Sitting up in bed at that time.—Did you observe whether there was anything in the expression of his countenance? Nothing very particular; the room was rather dark.—Then he asked you to do something? To rub his neck.—Did he say why? I do not think he said why; he said, “Rub my neck.”—Did you rub his neck for him? Yes, and supported him.—What part of the neck? The back part of the neck.—How was he supported? He was supported by my arm at the time.

By the Attorney-General.—Did you observe anything about the back of the neck you were rubbing? There was a stiffness of the muscles; a sort of hardness about the neck.—How soon after the chambermaid went away did Palmer come? Very soon indeed; two or three minutes at the utmost.—Did he make any observation when he came in? He made the remark, “I was never so quickly dressed in my life.”—Did you observe how he was dressed? I did not; I was so engaged.—Did he bring in anything with him? He gave him two pills; he told me they were ammonia pills.—What did he do with them? Cook swallowed them.—After he had swallowed the

pills, what next happened? Directly he had swallowed them, he uttered loud screams.—That was directly after he had swallowed them? Yes; he threw himself back in the bed, and was dreadfully convulsed.—I presume that, as the pills had been immediately before taken, it could not have been from the action of those last-taken pills? Certainly not.—You say he was dreadfully convulsed; did he say anything? He said to me, “Raise me up, or I shall be suffocated.”—How long did the convulsions last? Five or ten minutes.—Was that before he called out to raise him up or he should be suffocated? At the time; that was at the commencement of the convulsions. — Let me understand; you say he threw himself back on the bed and was convulsed; was it at the time he threw himself back upon the bed he called out to be raised up? Yes; just after he was down.—The convulsions then setting in as I understand you? Yes.—You say he was dreadfully convulsed; over what parts of the body did those convulsions extend? All the muscular fibres; there was a violent contraction of every muscle of the body and a stiffening of the limbs.—When he called out to you to raise him lest he should be suffocated, what was done? I endeavoured to do so with the assistance of Mr. Palmer, but I found it was quite impossible.—Owing to what? Owing to the rigidity of the limbs; when he found that I could not raise him up, he asked me to turn him over.—Did you do so? I did; he was quite sensible.—He was then quite sensible? Quite sensible.—What happened next? I listened to the action of his heart.—Was that after you had turned him over?

Yes.—What did you find? I found it gradually to weaken; I requested Palmer to go and fetch some ammonia for him; some spirits of ammonia.—To revive the action of the heart? Yes, as a stimulant.—For the purpose of reviving him, I suppose? In the hopes of doing so.—Did Palmer leave for that purpose? He went to his house and fetched a bottle.—How long was he gone? A very short period.—What should you say? Not above a minute; he was very quick.—When he came back, in what condition was Cook? The heart was gradually sinking, and life was almost extinct; he died very quietly.—How soon after Palmer returned did he die? Very soon afterwards; he was not able to take the ammonia.—From the time when he first roused you to the time when he died, what period in your judgment elapsed? When he first called upon me, do you mean?—From the time when he raised himself in his bed, and called upon you to go for Palmer. I suspect from ten minutes to a quarter of an hour.—When death took place, was he still upon his side? He was upon his side.—After death; in what position was he when he was dead? Upon his side still.—Did you turn the body upon its back? No.—Did you observe what was the outward appearance of the body after death? It was very dark; I could not make the observation I otherwise should have made; there was only one candle in the room.—Had you any opportunity of observing in what position his hands were? Yes, clenched.—Both hands? Both hands; the left hand particularly, which I had in my hand.—How soon did you observe that clenching of the hands? Immediately the attack took place, when

he threw himself back.—At the time you were rubbing his neck, did you observe anything the matter with the hands? No.—At what part of the attack? When he threw himself back.—Which you say was immediately after taking the pills Palmer brought over? Yes.—When you were rubbing his neck, you did not at that time see the hands clenched? No.—Did you observe either before or at the time of death, or immediately afterwards, anything in the position of the head and neck? Yes; the head was quite bent back.—When you say quite bent back, do you mean bent back into an unnatural position? Yes.

Lord Campbell.—By spasmodic action? By spasmodic action.

By the Attorney-General.—Did you observe whether there was any effect produced by spasmodic action in the formation of the body as regards the back? Yes, the body was twisted back like a bow; the back-bone was twisted back.

Lord Campbell.—When did you observe that appearance? Immediately after death, or all the time; indeed, after throwing himself back, he was immediately drawn back.

By the Attorney-General.—If you had placed the body at that time upon the back, in what position would it have rested? Upon the head and heels; if I had placed the body in that position upon a level surface, it would have rested upon the head and heels.—Did you observe anything immediately after or at the time of death about the jaw? No; his face was turned away from me, I could not notice that.—After death, did you see whether the jaw was in its natural condition, or whether it had been affected by spasmodic action? It was all affected by spasmodic action.

Mr. Charles Newton sworn.—What are you? Assistant to Mr. Salt, the surgeon, of Rugeley.—Mr. Salt is a practising surgeon there? He is.—Do you know William Palmer? I do.—Do you remember Monday the 19th of November? I do.—Did you see William Palmer on that evening? I did.—Where did you see him? At Mr. Salt's surgery.—Did he come there to you? He came there about 9 o'clock in the evening.—Were you alone when he came to you? I was.—What did he say to you? He asked me for three grains of strychnia.—Did he say more to you? I weighed it accurately, and gave it to him.—In what did you give it to him; how did you enclose it? In a small paper.—It is a white powder, is not it? Yes.—What did he say to you when you gave it him? He did not make any remark; he said, "Good night."—Did he take it away with him? He took it away with him?—Did he pay you for it? No; he did not.—You say he did not pay you for it; did you give it to him, or sell it to him? I gave it to him.—You knew him to be a medical man? Yes; I did.—And you made no charge? No charge.

Lord Campbell.—What would have been the charge? We do not sell drugs; we do occasionally sell just pills, or anything of that kind; we have not a retail shop.

By Mr. James.—You mean, you sell medicines as apothecaries, made up; but you would not sell strychnia to an ordinary person coming for it? No.—How long did this occupy, his coming for the strychnia and your giving it him? I do not think he was in the shop above two minutes; just while I weighed it accurately.—When did you see Palmer again? On the 25th of

November.—Did you see him on the 20th, the following day? Yes, the 20th of November.—Where did you see him on Tuesday, the 20th? At Mr. Hawkins's shop.—What is Mr. Hawkins; what shop does he keep? A druggist's.—About what time of the day did you see him on the Tuesday at Mr. Hawkins's shop? I am not quite sure about the time; between 11 and 12 o'clock, I think.—In the day? In the daytime.—Was Hawkins's, the druggist's shop, the shop at which you dealt for medicines and compounds? Yes; we have drugs from them when we are out; we have our drugs generally from London.—Were you in the habit of calling in at Hawkins's shop as you went by? Very frequently.—Did you say that Palmer was in the shop when you went in? He was.—Did he speak to you? He did.—What did he say to you? He asked me how I was, and put his hand upon my shoulder, and I went with him to the door.—How came you to go to the door with him? He put his hand between my shoulders, and said he wished to speak to me.—You went to the door with him? I did.—When you got to the door with him, what did he say to you? He asked me when Mr. Edwin Salt was going to his farm.—Did you go only to the door, or did you go out into the street? Out into the street; when we got to the door, Mr. Palmer went a little distance from the door.—Into the street? Yes.—When you were in the street with him, what did he say to you? He asked me when Mr. Edwin Salt was going to his farm; and whilst we were talking, a person of the name of Brassington came up.—Was Mr. Edwin Salt the son of Mr. Salt,

your employer? He is.—Where was the farm which he asked if he was going to? At Sudbury.—About how far is that? Perhaps 14 miles; I never was there.—Had Palmer anything to do with this farm at all; did you understand what he meant? It was rumoured in the town that Mr. Edwin Salt was going.—Had Palmer anything to do with it? Not at all.—While he was speaking, you said something about Mr. Brassington? Mr. Brassington came up; Mr. Brassington, the cooper.—Did Brassington speak to you, and enter into a conversation with you? He did.—While Brassington was speaking to you, what did Palmer do? Palmer went away.—Did you remain in the same place where Brassington spoke to you? Yes; Mr. Brassington had two bills for Mr. Salt.—What was Brassington? A cooper.

Lord Campbell.—What bills were they? Bills for money.

Mr. James.—Bills he had against him? Yes.—Bills for what he had done? Yes; for work done for Mr. Salt.—Did Brassington speak to you about those bills, and engage your attention? Yes.—While Brassington was talking to you about those bills in the street, what did Palmer do? He left me, and went into Hawkins's shop.—He went back again into the shop? Yes.—Did you see Palmer come out of Hawkins's shop? I did.—When he came out of Hawkins's shop, were you still talking to Mr. Brassington in the street? I was.—Did Palmer speak to you when he came out of the shop?—I am not quite sure; he went by me. I was talking with Mr. Brassington at the time.—Which way did he go? Towards his own house.—How far is Hawkins's shop from

Palmer's house? About 200 yards, I should think: perhaps more; between 200 and 300 yards.—After your conversation with Brassington had ended, did you go into Hawkins's shop? I did.—You must not tell us what you said; is there a person of the name of Roberts, an apprentice at Hawkins's? Yes; there is.—Was he in Hawkins's shop, serving, when you went in? He was in the shop.—You must not tell us what he said when you went into the shop; had you some conversation with Roberts about Palmer? Yes.—Do you know a man of the name of Thirlby? Yes.—Does Thirlby deal in drugs? He does.—Has he ever been assistant to Palmer; is he a man who succeeded to Palmer's business, do you know? He is.—Do you remember Sunday the 25th of November? I do.—Where were you about 7 o'clock on that evening? At Mr. Palmer's house.—What was the cause of your going there? I was sent for.—Who came for you, do you remember? I am not quite sure.—You went to Palmer's house in consequence of being sent for? Yes.—Where did you find Palmer when you went? In the kitchen.—What was he doing? He was reading; sitting by the fire, reading.—What did he say to you? He asked me how I was: he asked me to have a little brandy.—Did you sit down and take some? I did.—You sat down and took some brandy? I am not quite sure whether I did sit down.

Lord Campbell.—Had you some brandy? Some brandy-and-water.

Lord Campbell.—Was there any one else present? No, there was not.

By Mr. James.—What did he say to you? He asked me what would

be a dose of strychnia that would kill a dog, I told him a grain; he asked me whether it would be found in the stomach; what would be the appearance of the stomach.—After death? Yes.—What did you say? I told him there would be no inflammation, and I did not think it would be found.—Did he make any remark upon that? I think he said, “It is all right.”

Lord Campbell.—You think he said so? That it would be all right, as if he were speaking to himself, and he did that (*snapping his fingers*).—Did he snap his fingers? Yes.

By Mr. James.—Did you see him do so? Yes.—Did you talk about some other ordinary matters of conversation afterwards? Yes; he made some other remarks.—You mean in general casual conversation? Yes.—You were examined before the coroner? I was.—Before the coroner you did not say anything of your having given to Palmer three grains of strychnia on the night of the 19th of November? I did not.—To whom did you first tell this of his having had from you three grains of strychnia on Monday night? I told Mr. Cheshire, the postmaster.

Cross-examined.—When did you first mention this about the three grains? It was after the inquest.—How long after the inquest? I cannot say when.—Was it a week ago? A week since from now do you mean?—Yes. Yes, it was.

Lord Campbell.—How long after the inquest? I cannot tell how long; it might have been a week after the inquest, or it might have been two or three days; I am not quite sure.

By Mr. Grove.—Might it have been a fortnight? I should think not.—Can you undertake to say it

was less than a fortnight? Yes, I think I can.—Were you after the inquest examined on behalf of the Crown? Before the inquest.—After the inquest were you examined for the purpose of giving evidence on behalf of the Crown? Yes, I was.—When? It was some time after.—How long after? I really cannot undertake to say; it was after the inquest.—I do not want you to name the day or the week; how long after?

Lord Campbell.—Was it before or after what you had mentioned to Cheshire? It was after then.

Mr. Grove.—How long after what you had mentioned to Cheshire? I cannot undertake to say.—Can you tell me whether it was a fortnight, a week, or a month? I do not know.—Cannot you name within a month the time when you were first examined for the purpose of giving evidence for the Crown? I do not know, and I cannot say.—When you were first examined for this purpose, did you say anything about the purchase of the three grains of strychnia? No, I did not.—When you were first examined on behalf of the Crown, did you mention the circumstance of the conversation about a dog—poisoning a dog? Yes, I did.—How many different examinations have you given for the purpose of your evidence here? One; twice I have been examined; I gave a statement to Mr. Gardiner.—Was that before the inquest? No, it was not.—After the inquest? Yes.—How soon after? It was some time after.—What time? I cannot say precisely.—Did you mention to him the matter about the dog at that time? Yes, I did.—Did you mention to him the matter about the three grains of strychnia? No, I did not.—You were examined at

the inquest, I think you have stated; did you say anything at the inquest either about conversation with respect to the dog, or with respect to the three grains of strychnia? No, I did not.

Lord Campbell.—Were you examined before the coroner about Palmer's going to Hawkins's shop? I was.

By Mr. Grove.—I believe you did give evidence of your conversation with Palmer at the door of Mr. Hawkins's? I did.—Did you then hear that he had purchased, or was alleged to have purchased, strychnia at Hawkins's shop? Of course I did, or I should not have told it.

Re-examined by Mr. Attorney General.—You have said that you gave information to the Crown about this fact of the three grains of strychnia on Tuesday? Yes.—How was it you did not give that information before? On account that Mr. Palmer had not been friends with Mr. Salt; they never speak to each other.—What had that to do with it? I thought Mr. Salt would be displeased at my letting him have anything.—You say they did not speak? No; Mr. Thirlby lived with Mr. Salt for nineteen years.—Was it in consequence of Mr. Thirlby going to Palmer's that this difference took place between Mr. Palmer and Mr. Salt? Yes; Mr. Salt did not speak to Mr. Palmer, or Mr. Thirlby either.—Was there any other reason besides that for your keeping it back? That was my only reason.—To whom did you first communicate it; you communicated it first, you say, to Cheshire the postmaster? Yes.—On Tuesday last, when you first came and communicated it to the Crown, did any one suggest to you to do so,

or did you do it of your own accord? I did it voluntarily.—No one advised you to do it? No; I thought it my duty to do it.—To whom did you mention it first on Tuesday? To Mr. Boycott.—That is a clerk to Mr. Gardiner? Yes.—Where did you see him? At the Rugeley station.—Were you then coming up to London? I was.—You were at the station for the purpose of coming up to London? Yes; I met all the witnesses there.—The witnesses were assembled there coming up to London for the trial? Yes.—You saw Boycott? Yes, I saw Boycott, and I went to him.—What did you tell Boycott? I asked him whether I could see Mr. Gardiner when I came up.—You had your subpœna, and were coming up with the other witnesses? Yes; by the fifteen minutes past eight train from Rugeley.—Did you tell Boycott what you wanted to see Mr. Gardiner for? Yes, I did.—What did he do; did he bring you to Mr. Gardiner? He did.—Where was Mr. Gardiner? In London.—As soon as you arrived in London Mr. Boycott brought you to Mr. Gardiner, did he? Yes.—Then, I believe, you were brought to this gentleman, the Solicitor for the Treasury? Yes.—And you made your statement to him? I did.—In the mean time, I presume you had communicated to Mr. Gardiner what you had to say? I had.

Mr. Serjeant Shee.—Will your Lordship ask this witness whether he has not given another reason; the reason being that he was afraid he should be indicted for perjury? Yes, I did; I did not give it as a reason; I mentioned it to the gentleman sitting there (Mr. Greenwood). I did not give it as a reason. I stated what I had heard about a

young man from Wolverhampton whom Mr. George Palmer had indicted for perjury, because this young man could not produce a book to show that he had sold him some prussic acid.—In what case was that? Upon the inquest upon Walter Palmer.

Lord Campbell.—You were asked whether you had not given some reason. I did not give it as a reason.

By the Attorney-General.—What was it you stated? I stated about this young man from Wolverhampton.—Tell us what you said. I told him about this young man from Wolverhampton.—What did you tell him? I had heard in Rugeley of the young man being indicted for perjury.—That he had been indicted, or that they had threatened to indict him? That he was threatened to be indicted.—By whom? By George Palmer.—That is the brother of William? Yes; because he had sold the prisoner prussic acid.—Because he had said so at the inquest; had this young man said at the inquest that he had sold prussic acid? Yes.—At what inquest? On Walter Palmer; and he did not enter it in the book, so that he could not prove it.—Did you mention at that time, in your conversation, what George Palmer had said he would do with him? That he would transport him.

Charles Joseph Roberts sworn.—In November last were you an apprentice to Mr. Hawkins a druggist at Rugeley? Yes.—Do you know the prisoner William Palmer? Yes.—Do you remember Tuesday the 20th of November? Yes.—Did you see the prisoner on that day? Yes.—Where did you see him? He came into Mr. Hawkins's shop.—About what time? I

believe it was between 11 and 12 o'clock in the day.—Did he say anything to you when he came? Yes.—What did he say? He asked first for two drachms of prussic acid.—Did he bring anything with him? He brought a bottle for it.—What did you do then? I was putting it up for him, when Mr. Newton the assistant to Mr. Salt came into the shop.—Did Palmer speak to Newton? Yes, he did.—Do you remember what he said to him? He told him he wanted to speak to him.—Palmer said he wanted to speak to him? Yes, and they went out of the shop together.—Palmer and Newton? Yes.—Do you know a person of the name of Brassington, a cooper? Yes.—After Palmer had gone out of your shop did you see Brassington the cooper? Yes, he took Newton away from Palmer.—You saw that? Yes.—Did he get into conversation with him? Yes.—Can you see from the shop window into the street? Yes.—From the shop? Yes.—You can clearly? Yes.—Now, when Brassington took Newton away with him in conversation, what did Palmer do? He came back again into the shop.

Lord Campbell.—What were you doing when Palmer came back? I was putting the prussic acid into the bottle.

By Mr. James.—You were in the act of putting up the prussic acid; what did he say to you? He asked for six grains of strychnine.—Anything more? And two drachms of Batley's solution of opium.—Is that what is commonly called Batley's sedative? Yes.—Now, while you were putting up these preparations for the prisoner, did you observe where he was standing? Yes.

Lord Campbell.—What became of the prussic acid? That remain-

ed on the counter while I was putting up the other.

By Mr. James.—You had put up the prussic acid ready for him, and then he asked for the six grains of strychnine and the Batley's sedative? Yes.

Mr. Justice Cresswell.—And you placed the prussic acid on the counter? Yes.

By Mr. James.—Were you behind the counter preparing these things? Yes.—While you were behind the counter preparing these things for the prisoner, did you observe where he was standing? At the shop door.—Now when he ordered these things of you, when he returned into the shop, did he order them at the counter? Yes, he did.—While you were preparing them, was it then he moved from the counter to the street door? Yes.—Which way was he looking while he was standing at the street door? I do not know.—I do not mean which way was he looking into the street, but with his back to you? Yes.—That is what I mean, looking with his back to you into the street, standing in the door-way? Yes.—How long do you suppose you took in the preparation of these things for him before you delivered them to him? About five minutes.—Did he remain standing at the door until you were ready to give him the things? Yes.—Did you then deliver the things to him?—Yes, I did.—That is, the prussic acid in the bottle which he had brought? Yes.—How was the strychnine delivered? In a paper.

Lord Campbell.—The quantity you spoke of? Yes.

Mr. James.—Six grains, and the Batley's solution of opium, the sedative? Yes.—In a phial? Yes.—Did he take them away? Yes.—Did he pay you for them?

Yes.—Now, from the time that Mr. Palmer returned to your shop after he left Mr. Newton, and from the time you delivered him these things, was there any other person in the shop? No.—Now, after the prisoner had left with these things, did Mr. Newton come into your shop? Yes, he did.—You must not tell us what he said to you or you to him; but had you some conversation about Palmer's purchasing these things; do not say what; had you some conversation with him? Yes, I had.—Did he make some remark to you? do not tell us what it was. Yes, he did.

Mr. James.—We shall very likely have to read his deposition to-morrow.

William Vernon Stephens sworn.—I believe you are a merchant living in the City? I am in no business now; I have retired from business.—You were the step-father of the deceased Mr. John Parsons Cook? I was.—You married his father's widow? I did.—* * Had you gone to Palmer on your arrival at Rugeley? I met Palmer in the passage of the inn.—Now, was anything said at that interview on the subject of his funeral? I then turned round and said, "Whether he has left anything or not, poor fellow, he must be buried."—You said this? I said this.—What did Palmer say? Palmer then immediately said, "Oh! I will bury him myself, if that is all."—What did you say? I said, "I cannot hear of your doing that." his brother-in-law was present, the husband of his sister.—He had come there? He had come there to meet me.—Did he make any remark?—He immediately expressed a great wish to be allowed to bury him; I said, "No, no, that is my business; as executor, I must

take care and bury him."—He had appointed you his executor under his will? Yes.—Was anything said by you on the subject of the body remaining at the inn? I said, "I cannot have the funeral immediately, because I intend to bury him in London, in his mother's grave; I am very sorry for the inconvenience to the people here at the inn, but I will get it done as soon as possible;" Palmer said, "Oh, that is of no consequence, but the body ought to be fastened up at once:" he repeated that in other words; he said, "So long as the body is fastened up, it is of no consequence for a day or two."—Now, I believe that terminated the conversation on that subject for the time? For the time.—Tell me what took place after that. While I was talking to the deceased's brother-in law, Palmer and Mr. Jones left the room.—Did they afterwards return? They returned in about half an hour.—On their return what took place? On their return I expressed a desire to know from Palmer the name of some respectable undertaker that I might call in.—Some undertaker in Rugeley? Some undertaker in Rugeley.—Did you say for what? I said that I might at once order a coffin, and give directions for the funeral.—What did Palmer say upon that? Palmer said, "Oh! I have been and done that, I have ordered a shell and a strong oak coffin." * *

The Attorney General.—You left London by the two o'clock train, and got to Rugeley about eight? About eight.—On your way down did you see Palmer? On my arrival at the platform at Euston Square I saw Palmer.

Lord Campbell.—You saw him as you were leaving London? Yes, as I was leaving London. What

did he tell you that he was there for? He said he had been summoned to London.—That was at Euston Square? That was at Euston Square.

By the Attorney General.—What did he tell you? That he had received a telegraph message after I left.—Is that all that passed then? Which had brought him to London.—Is that all that passed then? I think I asked him where Mr. Cook's horses were kept; he told me at Hednesford. I think he said he would drive me out there if I wished it.—Did you see him again when you got to Wolverton? When I got to Wolverton I saw him again in the refreshment-room. The train stops there for a few minutes.—Did any conversation take place between you? I said, "Mr. Palmer, this is a very melancholy thing, the death of my poor son happening so suddenly, and I think, for the sake of his brother and sister, who are sometimes delicate in health, it would be desirable to know what his complaints were."

Lord Campbell.—By his brother and sister, you mean your children by his mother?

By the Attorney General.—Do you mean his half-brother and sister? His half-brother and his own sister; I think I said it might be desirable that their medical friends should know something of his complaint, "and therefore I think I should like his body opened;" to that Palmer replied, "That can be done very well;" or "That can be easily done;" or something of that sort: I think nothing more passed then, or very little more; nothing of importance; the bell rang and we went to our seats.—Did anything happen when you got to Rugeley? When we reached

Rugeley, Palmer said, "You were talking about a solicitor;" he again said, "Do you know any solicitor in Rugeley?" I said, "No, I do not; for you know I am a perfect stranger here;" he then said, "Oh, I know them all intimately; I can introduce you to one;" he said, "When I get home I must take a cup of coffee, and as soon as I have had that I will come over and tell you all about it;" I thanked him, as I had done once before, and said I would not trouble him; he then repeated his offer, that he only wanted a cup of coffee, and he would come to me immediately; but he added, "You will not find any solicitor to-night;" I said, "Why not?" he said, "It is late; besides, some of them live out of town;" "Well," I said, "I never found any difficulty in finding a solicitor when I wanted one before." I think it was immediately after that, that, changing the tone of my voice and manner, I said, "Mr. Palmer, if I should call in a solicitor to give me advice, I suppose you will have no objection to answer him any questions he might choose to put to you?"—Did you alter your tone, as you spoke of, purposely? Purposely; I had previously mentioned the *post-mortem*.—Did the alteration of your tone and manner appear to you to produce any impression upon him? The moon was shining, but I cannot say that I could see his face distinctly.—What did he say in answer? He said, with a spasmodic affection of the throat, which was perfectly evident, "Oh, no, certainly not."—You say you had previously mentioned the *post-mortem* examination to him, or the intention of having one? I had mentioned my desire to have the body opened.* *

After a short pause I said, "Pray, Mr. Palmer, did you attend my poor son in a medical capacity?" he said, "Oh dear, no;" I said, "I ask you that question because I am determined to have his body examined, and if you had attended him medically I suppose the gentlemen I shall call in would think it proper that you should be present." I think the next thing he said was, "Can you tell me who is to perform the examination?" or words to that effect.—What did you say? I said, "I cannot, I shall not know myself until the morning; but I think it right to tell you of it; I shall have it done for my satisfaction, and whether you are present or not is a matter of indifference to me if the gentlemen employed think it right you should attend." "So it is to me," he said.

Examination of Dr. Harland.—After this interruption, did the opening of the stomach proceed? Yes.—Was it found to contain anything particular? It contained a few ounces of brownish liquid.—About how many? I should think, about two or three ounces. Nothing particular in that? No.—Was that said in the hearing of the persons there, that there was nothing particular found in the stomach? Yes.—Who stated that? Palmer himself.—He was looking on? He was looking on.—Do you remember what he said? I think he said, "They will not hang us yet."—To whom did he say that? To Mr. Bamford.—Was that observation of his after somebody had said anything about the stomach, or as mere observation upon it himself? As mere observation upon it himself.—Were the intestines then examined? Yes.—Nothing particular found in them, I suppose?

No, they were contracted; they were very small.—Were they, the viscera, placed in the jar with their contents as they were taken from the body? Yes.—What then was done with the jar? It was tied over with two bladders and sealed.—Did you tie them and seal them? Yes.—And after you had so done, where did you place the jar? On the table beside the body.—Did you notice where Palmer was at the time you placed the jar on the table? He was moving about.—Moving about the room? Moving about the room.—Did you miss the jar from where you had placed it on the table? Yes, in a few minutes.—During that time your attention had been called away by the examination? Yes.—What did you say or do on missing the jar from the table? I called out, “Where is the jar?” and Palmer from the other end of the room said, “It is here.”—Did he say anything more? He said, “I thought it more convenient for you to take away.”—Is there a door at that end of the room? Yes.—How near was Palmer to that door? Within a very short distance.—How near? A yard or two, I should think.—How far from where you were, where the body was? The distance about half across this court.

By Mr. Bodkin.—On his calling this out did you go and take possession of the jar? He brought it to us.—You called to him to bring it to you? Yes.—What did you say? I said, “Will you bring it here?” I also went to the other end of the table, and met him nearly half way.—He was coming with it? He was coming with it.—Was the jar then in the same state in which it was when you placed it on the table? No.—What had been done

to it? There was a cut through both bladders.—How long a cut? Hardly an inch long.—Had that been done with some sharp instrument? Yes.—Did you examine the cut to see whether any of the contents of the jar had passed through it? Yes.—Was it quite clean? It was quite clean.—When you found this cut had been made in the jar, did you make any inquiry about it? Yes.—What did you say? I said, “Here is a cut; who has done this?”—Did you say that aloud, so as to be heard by all the persons there? Yes.—Did anybody answer? Yes; Palmer, and Mr. Devonshire, and Mr. Newton seemed all to say they had not done it.—I believe nothing more was said about it then? No.—When you were about to remove the jar from the room did the prisoner put any question to you? Yes.—What did he ask you? He asked me what I was going to do with the jar; I said I should take it to Mr. Frere.—Did he say anything on that? He said, “I would rather you take it with you to Stafford, if you would take it there.”—What did you say? I then took it to Mr. Frere.

James Myatt sworn.—In November last were you postboy at the Talbot Arms at Rugeley? Yes.—Do you remember Mr. Palmer, the prisoner? Yes.—Do you remember Monday, 26th of November last? Yes.—Were you ordered on that evening to take Mr. Stephens to the Stafford Station? On the Monday night.—About what time did you get the order to take Mr. Stephens to the Stafford Station? It was a little after five.—Now, before you started, did you go home to get your tea? Yes.—On returning from your tea to the Talbot Arms

did you meet the prisoner? Yes.—Did he speak to you? Yes.—What did he say to you? He asked me if I was going to drive them to Stafford: Mr. Stephens.—What did you say? I told him I was.—What did he say to you then? He asked me if I would upset them.—Was anything said about a jar?

Mr. Serjeant Shee.—Let us have what he said.

By Mr. James.—It is a perfectly legitimate question.—Was anything said about a jar? He said he supposed I was going to take the jars.—What did you say then, or what did he say? I said I believed I was.—After you said you believed you were, what did he say? He says, “Do you think you could upset them?”—What answer did you make? I told him “No.”—Did he say anything more? He said, if I could there was a 10*l*. note for me.—What did you say to that? I told him I should not.—Did he say any more to you? I told him that I must go, for the horse was in the fly waiting for me to start.—Before that was said, do you remember whether he said anything more about the jars? I do not recollect.—Did he say why he wanted you to upset them; did he say any more to you about it? you must tell the whole truth here.—Not any more about the jars. Did he say *any* more at that time to you? Yes.—You must tell the whole. I told him if I did not go there was somebody else would go; he told me not to be in a hurry.—You must tell the whole of what he said to you. He told me not to be in a hurry, for if any one else went he would pay me.—Did he say more to you that evening? I do not recollect.—Did you see him the next day? I saw him the next

morning.—Did he speak to you? When I was going to my breakfast.—Do you pass his house to go to your breakfast? Yes.—Did he speak to you? Yes.—What did he say to you? He asked me who went.—Who went with the fly? Yes.—What did you tell him? I told him Mr. Stephens and I believed it was one of Mr. Gardiner's clerks.—Then what did he say to that? did he say anything when you told him that? He said he believed it was: I do not recollect anything more.

Cross-examined by Mr. Serjeant Shee.—You say he asked you whether you were going to drive them to Stafford: what conversation was there between you and him before he used the words, “going to drive them to Stafford?” I had not spoken to him before.—How do you know what he meant by “going to drive them to Stafford?” I knew I was going to take some one to Stafford.—But did he use the words, “going to drive them to Stafford?” Them was the words, I believe.—Did he use the name “Stephens?” Mr. Stephens's name was mentioned.—Was it mentioned before he used these words to you, asking you if you were going to drive them to Stafford? I do not recollect.—How do you know he mentioned “Stephens?” He mentioned Mr. Stephens afterwards.

Lord Campbell.—Did he mention Mr. Stephens that evening? Not at first.—But in the course of that conversation? Yes.

By Mr. Serjeant Shee.—How near were you to the Talbot Arms? Between three hundred and four hundred yards.—Had you been preparing a fly? I did not prepare the fly; the fly was prepared while I went to my tea.—Was there

any other gentleman at the Talbot Arms at the time, any visitors besides Mr. Stephens and his party? I cannot say; there might be.—You understood the word “them” to mean Mr. Stephens and his party; was that what you say? Yes.—Were not these the words Palmer used: “I should not mind giving 10*l.* to break Mr. Stephens’s neck?” I do not recollect him saying, “to break his neck.”—Were they not words to that effect, “I should not mind giving 10*l.* to break his neck?” I do not recollect that.—Then “10*l.* to upset him?” Yes.—Those were the words, were they? Them were the words to the best of my recollection.—Did he appear to have been drinking at the time? I cannot say.—When he said “to upset him,” did he use any epithet; did he describe him in any way, such as “upset the fellow?” He did not describe him in any way.—Did he say anything about him at the time? He did say something about it; it was a humbugging concern, or something to that effect.—That he was a humbugging concern, was that it? No.—That it was a humbugging concern, or something to that effect? Yes.—Did he say anything more on the subject, that he was a suspicious, troublesome fellow? I do not recollect him saying anything of that.—Did he speak angrily of him, in an angry tone? I cannot say that he did.—Did not describe him in any way? No more than that.—He gave you no notions, from what he said, of what reason he had to complain of him? No.—Do not you collect from what he said he had been very troublesome and suspicious? He did not say anything about that.

Re-examined by the Attorney

General.—My friend has put the words to you in a somewhat different form; just let me have your words over again; give it your own way. What was it Palmer said to you when he saw you there in the street? He asked me if I was going to drive them to Stafford? I told him I believed I was. “Was it Mr. Stephens I was going to take?” I said, “I believed it was.”—What did you say then? He supposed I was going to take the jars; I told him I was. He asked me if I would upset them. I told him I should not: if I would, he said, there was a 10*l.* note for me.—What part of the conversation was it at which he said it was a humbugging concern? It was towards the middle of it.—Was it before or after he had offered you the 10*l.*? I cannot exactly say.—Do you recollect whether it was before or after? I cannot recollect whether it was before or after.—Was that all that was said, or do you remember anything else? That is all I recollect at that time.

Mr. Herring, whom Palmer had employed to get in Cook’s winnings at Shrewsbury, detailed those transactions exactly as the Attorney-General had stated them.

The Attorney General then proceeded to call the medical witnesses. They were examined at great length and with great minuteness. The examination of each of these gentlemen was a complete medical treatise on tetanus, idiopathic or traumatic, or arising from poison. The statements of the physicians and chemical professors described the constituents, mode of action, and analysis of strychnia. It is quite impracticable to abridge (and if it were possible it would, as matter of evidence applicable to this particular

case, be quite useless) the scientific statements of these gentlemen. Besides the local medical practitioners who attended Cook, some of whom were able men, the Crown brought forward the most reputed surgeons and physicians of the day. Mr. Curling, Surgeon to the London Hospital; Dr. Todd, Physician to King's College Hospital, and Lecturer on Physiology and Anatomy; Mr. Jolly, Surgeon and Lecturer at St. Thomas' Hospital; Mr. Lee, Surgeon to the Lock Hospital; Sir Benjamin Brodie; Professor Brande; Professor Christison, Professor of Materia Medica to the University of Edinburgh; Dr. Jackson, an eminent physician, who had practised many years in India, where idiopathic and traumatic tetanus are frequent, were among the witnesses examined. These gentlemen had been in Court during the trial and had heard the evidence. They described with infinite minuteness the symptoms which attend the natural disease, and distinguish the idiopathic from the traumatic tetanus, and both of these from the tetanus which has been observed to follow the administration of strychnia. The tenor of their statements may be summed up thus—that the symptoms of Cook's attacks were not consistent either with idiopathic or traumatic tetanus, and were such as follow the administration of strychnia; that there was nothing discoverable in his body which would cause, and which would result from, idiopathic tetanus; that there was no wound or injury, internal or external, which would produce traumatic tetanus; and that the venereal affections, even if recent, and other diseases which Cook might have suffered from, could not have pro-

duced traumatic tetanus; and, on the other hand, that the examination of the body discovered appearances which were perfectly consistent with, and had been observed to accompany, death from strychnia. It was admitted by those who had conducted the analysis, that no strychnia had been found; antimony had been found in large quantities. The great eminence of Sir Benjamin Brodie makes it desirable to give his evidence.

Sir Benjamin Brodie, sworn.—Sir Benjamin, I believe you were surgeon at St. George's Hospital for many years? Yes.—You have had, I need not ask you, a very extensive practice? A considerable practice.—In the course of your practice have you had under your superintendence many cases of death from tetanus? A great many.—Is death from idiopathic tetanus in this country frequent or rare? According to my experience very rare.—The ordinary deaths are from traumatic tetanus? Yes.—Have you attended during the trial carefully to the description given of the symptoms on the Monday night and the Tuesday night attending the death of Mr. Cook? Yes, I attended to them.—In your opinion are the symptoms those of traumatic tetanus or not? As far as the spasmodic contraction of the muscles goes, the symptoms resemble those of traumatic tetanus; as to the course which the symptoms took, that was entirely different.—Did you attend to the detail of the narration of the attack on the Monday night? Yes, I did.—And its ceasing, and the patient being comfortable and composed during the Tuesday? Yes.—And then the attack again about ten minutes before 12 on the

Tuesday night? Yes.—Will you explain what you mean; in what respect they are different from traumatic tetanus? The symptoms of traumatic tetanus always begin, as far as I have seen, very gradually; the stiffness of the lower jaw being, I believe, invariably the symptom first complained of; at least, so it has been in my experience; then the contraction of the muscles of the back is always a later symptom, generally much later; the muscles of the extremities are affected in a much less degree than those of the neck and trunk, except in some cases where the injury has been in a limb, and an early symptom has been a spasmodic contraction of the muscles of that limb; I do not myself recollect a case in which, in ordinary tetanus, there was that contraction of the muscles of the hand which I understood was stated to have existed in this instance; then ordinary tetanus rarely runs its course in less than two or three days, and often is protracted to a much longer period; I know one case only in which the disease was said to have terminated in 12 hours.

Lord Campbell.—In so short a time as 12 hours? But probably in that case the early symptoms had been overlooked: then I never knew these symptoms of ordinary tetanus to last for a few minutes, then subside, then come on again after 24 hours; I think that those are the principal points of difference which I perceive between the symptoms of ordinary tetanus and those which I have heard described.

Mr. James. — Sir Benjamin Brodie, you are aware, of course, of the tetanus, or tetanic convulsions, which are the result of strychnine?

I have not witnessed them.—But as a surgeon do you know the effect on animal life?

Lord Campbell.—Do you know of experiments on animal life by strychnine? I have not made any myself.

Mr. James.—In your opinion was this a disease of the ordinary kind of tetanus, either traumatic or idiopathic? I do not believe that death here arose from what we ordinarily call tetanus, either idiopathic or traumatic.—Did you ever know a death from tetanus as the result of sore throat? Never.—Or the result of a chancre? Never, I never heard of it.—Or any other form of syphilitic disease? I never heard of a case.—In your judgment are the symptoms of death consistent with a fit of apoplexy such as you have heard described? No, they are not.—Or epilepsy? Perhaps I had better say at once that I never saw a case in which the symptoms that I heard described arose from any disease: when I say that, of course I refer not to particular symptoms, but to the general course which the symptoms took,

Cross-examined by Mr. Serjeant Shee.—Have you had any experience of idiopathic tetanus? I believe I remember one case in our hospital, in the physicians' ward, which was shown me as a case of idiopathic tetanus, but I doubted its deserving the name of tetanus.—I presume it was a very slight case, then, of tetanic convulsions? Yes; I do not remember the particulars.—I find in Dr. Copland's book the syphilitic poison is sometimes the cause of convulsions; is that so in your experience? I have never seen it produce convulsions, except as a consequence of disease in the bones of the head.

The evidence of Dr. Alfred Taylor, upon whom the direct burden of the case rested, occupied nearly the whole of the fifth day. When the witness had been conducted over the entire case by the Attorney-General, he was subjected to a vigorous cross-examination by Mr. Serjeant Shee, and was repeatedly re-examined and cross-examined. He admitted that he had been unable to detect strychnia in Cook's body; but in four experiments he had made with strychnia on rabbits he had succeeded in finding it in two, and he failed to find it in the other two. The evidence of Professor Taylor was corroborated on all questions of fact by Dr. Owen Rees, Lecturer on Materia Medica at Guy's Hospital, who examined Cook's body, and had made the analytical experiments with him. Perhaps the most interesting and striking part of the medical evidence for the Crown was that which described the deaths of persons who had died from strychnia, intentionally or accidentally administered. That the consequential symptoms should closely resemble those of Cook is no ground of surprise; but the accidental expressions of suffering were so closely similar as to be very striking.

Mr. Pratt, the solicitor and bill discounter, stated the transactions in which he had been engaged with Palmer and Cook, and produced the bills and letters referred to by the Attorney-General.

Mr. Serjeant Shee then addressed the jury for the prisoner. Commencing by an appeal to the jury to discard all preconceived notions, and to form their judgment solely on the evidence, the learned gentleman expressed his determination to meet the case set

up by the Crown foot by foot, at every stage; and added:—I commence his defence, I say it in all sincerity, with an entire conviction of his innocence. I believe that there never was a truer word pronounced than the words which he pronounced when he said "Not guilty" to this charge.

Gentlemen, the case which the Crown undertakes to establish against the prisoner at the bar, and to support by entirely circumstantial evidence is, or may be, shortly stated thus: they say that the prisoner having, in the second week in November, made up his mind that it was his interest to get rid of John Parsons Cook, deliberately prepared his body for deadly poison by the slower poison of antimony, and afterwards dispatched him by the deadly poison of strychnia. No jury will convict a man of the crime thus imputed to the prisoner, unless in the first place it be made clear that he had some motive for its commission, some strong reason for desiring the death of Cook; unless, in the second place, the symptoms of the deceased before death, and the appearance presented by his body after death, were consistent with the theory of death by strychnia poison, and inconsistent with the theory of death from other and natural causes; unless, thirdly, the circumstantial evidence against him is such as to be inexplicable upon the supposition of his innocence. Now, it is under these three heads that I intend to discuss the evidence that you have heard; and it must be plain to you that if I adhere to that order and method of treating the vast amount of proof which has been laid before you, I must exhaust the whole argument, and leave myself no chance with-

out immediate detection of evading any difficulty in the defence.

Before, however, I proceed to grapple in these close quarters with the case of the Crown, as made by the Attorney-General, allow me, that you may at once see the whole scope of the address with which I have to trouble you, to claim its proper place in the discussion for a fact which, though by no means concealed from you by the Attorney-General, yet appeared to me in that address by which he at once seized upon your judgment, to have been thrown too much into the shade—the fact that strychnia was not found in the body of John Parsons Cook. If he died from the poison of strychnia, he died within two hours of the administration to him of a very strong dose of it—he died within a quarter of an hour or 20 minutes of the effects of that dose being visible in the convulsions of his body; the *post-mortem* examination took place within six days of his death—there is not the least reason to suppose that between the time of the ingestion of the poison, if poison was taken, and the paroxysm in which he died, there was any dilution of it in the stomach, or any ejection of it by vomiting. Never, therefore, were circumstances more favourable; unless the science of chemical analysis is altogether a failure for detection of the poison of strychnia, never was there a case in which it ought to have been so easy to produce it. Now, the fact is, and it is beyond all question, that it was not found. Whatever we may think of Dr. Alfred Taylor, of his judgment, and of his discretion, we have no reason to doubt that he is a skilful analytical chemist; we have not the least

reason to suppose, we know the contrary, that he and Dr. Rees who assisted him, did not do all that the science of chemical analysis could enable man to do to detect the poison of strychnia. They had distinct information from the executor and near relative of the deceased, either personally or through his solicitor, that he, for some cause or other, had reason to suspect the poison of strychnia; they undertook the examination of the stomach, which, I think, upon the whole evidence, without adverting to that part of it now in detail, you will be satisfied was not in an unfavourable condition for a sufficiently accurate analysis, with the expectation that if strychnia had been taken it would be found, and without any doubt as to the efficiency of their tests to detect it; and yet in their letter of the 4th of December they say—“We do not find strychnia, prussic acid, or any trace of it; from the contents of the stomach having been drained away, not turned out of the jar, it is impossible to say whether any strychnia had or had not been given just before death, but it is quite possible for tartar emetic to destroy life, if given in repeated doses; and, as far as we can at present form an opinion, in the absence of any natural cause of death, the deceased may have died from the effects of antimony in this or some other form.” Having afterwards attended the inquest, and heard the evidence of Elizabeth Mills and Mr. Jones of Lutterworth, and the evidence of a person of the name of Roberts, who spoke to the purchase of strychnia poison by Palmer, on the morning of the Tuesday, Dr. Taylor came to the conclusion that the pills which were administered to Cook

on the Monday and Tuesday night contained strychnia, and that Mr. Cook was poisoned by it; and he came to that conclusion, though he had expressed an opinion in writing that he might, and these are his very words, have been poisoned by antimony, of which some trace was found by him in the body, while no trace was found of strychnia.

Gentlemen, I am not about to discuss that part of the case in detail, but I call your attention to it for the purpose of claiming for it its proper place in this discussion, and that you may know at the commencement of my address what the whole course of my argument will be, and not be under the impression that, because I do not under the three heads to which I have directed your attention advert particularly to that head, I intend to pass it over. I tell you exactly what the case for the defence will be, as to the point that strychnia was not found in Mr. Cook's body. Let me state it as fairly as I can: the gentlemen who have come to the conclusion that strychnia may have been there, though they did not find it, have arrived at that conclusion by experiments of a very partial kind indeed; they contend that the poison of strychnia is of that nature, that when once it has done its fatal work, and become absorbed into the system, it ceases to be the thing which it was when it was taken into the system; it becomes decomposed, its elements separated from each other, and therefore no longer capable of responding to the tests which, according to them, would certainly detect the poison of undecomposed strychnia; that is their case. They account for the fact

that it was not found, and for their still retaining the belief that it destroyed Mr. Cook, by that hypothesis. Now it is only an hypothesis; there is no foundation for it in experiment; it is not supported by the evidence of any eminent toxicologist but themselves; it is due to them to say, and to Dr. Taylor in particular to say, because it will be quite out of my power to speak of Dr. Christison through any part of this discussion except with the respect and consideration which is due to a man of eminent acquirements and of the highest character—it is due to Dr. Taylor to say that he does propound that theory in his book, but he propounds it as a theory of his own; he does not vouch, as I remember, any eminent toxicologist in support of it; and when we recollect that his knowledge on the matter consists—good humane man!—in having poisoned five rabbits 25 years ago, and five since this question of the guilt or innocence of Palmer arose, his opinion, I think, unsupported by the opinions of others, cannot have much weight with you; however, what I have to say now upon that point is, that I will call before you many gentlemen of the highest eminence in their profession, analytical chemists, to state to you their utter renunciation of that theory. I will call before you Mr. Nunneley, a Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons, and Professor of Surgery at the Leeds School of Medicine, who attended that case of strychnia poison that took place at Leeds, and to which we have agreed that no reference shall be made by name. I will call before you Dr. Williams, Professor of Materia Medica at the

Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, and surgeon for 18 years to the City of Dublin Hospital, who will tell you that he also entirely rejects that theory, and believes that it has no foundation in experiment or authority. I will call before you Dr. Letheby, one of the ablest and most distinguished among the men of science in this great city, Professor of Chemistry and Toxicology in the Medical College of the London Hospital, and Medical Officer of Health of the City of London, who also rejects that theory as a heresy unworthy of the belief of scientific men. I will call before you Dr. Nicholas Parker, of the College of Physicians, a Physician of the London Hospital, and Professor of Medicine to that institution, who concurs with Dr. Letheby in his opinion; Dr. Robinson, also, of the Royal College of Physicians; Mr. Rogers, Professor of Chemistry to St. George's School; and lastly I will call before you probably the most eminent chemical analyst in this country, Mr. William Herapath, of Bristol, who totally rejects the theory as utterly unworthy of credence: all of these gentlemen contending, and ready to depose to it on their oaths, that not only if half a grain, or the fiftieth part of a grain, but I believe they will go on to say, that if 5, or 10, or 20 times less than that quantity had entered into the human frame at all, it could be and must be detected by tests which are unerring; they will tell you this, not as the result of a day's cruelty for ever regretted on five rabbits, but upon a large and tried experience upon the inferior animals, made and created, as you know they were, for the benefit of mankind; upon

a very extensive experience in many cases, as to many of them, of the effects of strychnia on the human system; and not to detain you on this part of the case, to which I only now advert, not intending to press it on you later at any length, that you may see what the nature of the defence in point of medical testimony will be, I will satisfy you by evidence which I think must control your judgment, that the only safe conclusion at which you can arrive, is, that strychnia not having been found in Cook's body, under the circumstances of this case never could have been there. You will find that they all agree in this opinion, that no degree of putrefaction or fermentation in the human system could in their judgment so decompose the poison of strychnia, as that it should no longer possess those qualities which in its undecomposed state cause it to respond to the tests which are used for its detection.

Having said so much, I will now apply myself to what, in my judgment, is an equally important, if not more important, question in this case, one which I approach with no diffidence whatever except the distrust which I have, under the circumstances in which I speak, of myself, and which, if it were possible for me to write what I think upon it and then to read it to you, I do not entertain the smallest doubt that you must be convinced of the innocence of this man—the question whether, in the second week of November, 1855, he had a motive for the commission of this murder, some strong reason for desiring that Cook should die: I never will believe that, unless it be made clear to you that it was the interest of

William Palmer, or that he thought it was his interest, to destroy Cook,—I never will believe, till I hear your verdict pronounced, that a jury can come to the conclusion of his guilt. And it seems to me, upon the evidence which has been laid before you, abundantly clear, that it not only was not the interest of William Palmer that Cook should die, but that his death was the very worst calamity that could befall him, and that he could not possibly be ignorant that it must be immediately followed by his own ruin. That it was followed by his immediate ruin we know. We know that at the time when he is said to have commenced to plot the death of Cook he was in a condition of the greatest embarrassment. It was an embarrassment which, in its extreme intensity, had come but recently upon him, an embarrassment too in some degree mitigated by the circumstance that the person upon whom these bills, which have been stated to you to be forgeries, purported to be drawn, was his own mother, a lady of very large fortune, and with whom he was on the most affectionate terms. Still he was in a condition unquestionably of great embarrassment. My learned friend has raised the hypothesis of his having a wish to destroy Cook upon the ground of this embarrassment. My learned friend stated to you that the case of the Crown against the prisoner was this: that “being in desperate circumstances, with ruin, disgrace, and punishment staring him in the face, he took advantage of his intimacy with Cook, when Cook had been the winner of a considerable sum of money, to destroy him and get possession of his money.” That

is the theory of the Crown. Now let us test it as a matter of business, relieving, if possible, our minds from the anxiety we must all feel when the fate of a fellow-creature is at stake, as if it was a case in a private room for the decision of an arbitrator. It is my misfortune not to be able at times to speak otherwise than earnestly, but let us look at it as a matter of business, and scrutinize it in every corner. Was it his interest that in the second week in November, 1855, Mr. Cook should be killed by a railway accident? If it was not, we have no motive to ascribe to it. If it was not, and more, if the contrary was clearly his interest, no sensible man would believe that he deliberately plotted and committed the murder. A long correspondence has been put in, the material parts of which letters will, in a subsequent stage of the case, be called to your attention. There is evidently a great deal in it that does not touch the point in the case, but the learned Judge, before the end of the case, will direct your mind to a correct appreciation of the contents. I watched them with an anxiety which no words can express. Having had the advantage, for which I shall ever honour my learned friend, of reading the correspondence beforehand, I found the history, as told by the correspondence, filled up by the *vivâ voce* testimony which was afterwards given. I was aware, at least I firmly believed, that in that correspondence the innocence of the prisoner lay concealed; and I think that I shall be able to show you that it is demonstrative of this proposition that he not only had no motive to kill Cook, but that the death of Cook was

the very worst thing that could happen for him. I shall not apologise to you—you would think it very inopportune to do so—for going into the details of this matter. Allow me, confining myself, as it is my duty, to the evidence in the cause, to call your attention to the position in which these two men stood to each other. They had been intimate as racing friends for two or three years; they had had a great many transactions together; they were jointly interested in at least one race-horse which was training at the stables of Saunders at Hednesford; they generally stayed together at the same hotel; they were seen together on almost all the race-courses in the kingdom, and were known to be connected in betting transactions, and adventurers upon the same horses at the same races. It is in evidence that just before Cook's death he said, in the presence of his friend Jones, addressing Palmer, "Palmer, we have lost a great deal of money upon races this year." And though it is impossible, Cook being dead, and the mouth of the prisoner sealed, and transactions of this character not being recorded in regular books as the transactions in a merchant's counting-house are, to give you in the fulness of evidence the actual state of their relations to each other, yet it is abundantly clear, and I will make it more clear to you presently, that they were very closely connected. When, in the month of May, 1855, money was wanted either by Mr. Cook or Palmer, Palmer applied to Pratt for it. He wanted, I think, 200*l.* to make up a sum for the payment of a debt, he having, I think, a balance of 190*l.* in the hands of Pratt. Mr.

Pratt would not lend it him without security, and he proposed the security of his friend John Parsons Cook, a gentleman of respectability and a man of substance.

Now, what the exact state of the affairs of John Parsons Cook at that time was I do not know. Such a fortune as he had might be thrown down in a week by the course of life that he was leading. A young man who is reckless as to the mode in which he employs his fortune, and who has only 13,000*l.*, may, if he likes, for a year or two pass before the world as a man of much more considerable means; it is not everybody who will go to Doctors' Commons to ascertain what the exact amount of property he derived from his grandfather was. He was Mr. Cook of Lutterworth, a gentleman who had a stud of racehorses, who lived expensively, and was known to have inherited a fortune. He was a person whose friendship was at that time probably, and probably continued to be, a matter of considerable convenience to Palmer. You recollect, gentlemen, I am not defending Palmer against the crime of forgery. I am not defending him against the reckless improvidence of obtaining money at the enormous discounts at which he obtained it. The question is, whether he is guilty of murder. Palmer and Cook were then so circumstanced as early as the month of May, 1855. They had had another transaction previously to the date of November, 1855, which I will not advert to now, because it was taken second in the case of my learned friend the Attorney-General; but let us see what their position was in the second week of November, 1855. Respecting that, we have the evidence of Pratt, and from the correspondence which he

explained to us, there can be no doubt upon our minds. Amongst a mass of bills, amounting altogether to 11,500*l.*, which had been repeatedly renewed, there were two bills for 2000*l.* each, which became due in the last week in October; and there was another bill, or two other bills, amounting to 1500*l.*, which had become due some time before, but which were held over, as they say, from month to month; Palmer, who was liable upon them, paying for the advantage of having them held over at the end of every month, at what they call interest of about 60 per cent. These three bills, or sums of 2000*l.*, 2000*l.*, and 1500*l.*, were the embarrassments which were pressing upon him in the second week of November, and, be it observed, though pressing upon him, they were pressed upon him by a man who, no doubt, would have been glad to have got the principal, but who would also, upon anything approaching to security, have been very well pleased with the interest. How can capital, if it be secure, be better employed than at 40 or 60 per cent. per annum? As long as there was a vestige of good security, Mr. Pratt or Mr. Pratt's clients desired nothing better than that Palmer should continue to hold the money.

Now, in that state of things, on the 27th of October, Palmer, in answer to an urgent demand upon him for money on the ground of the security becoming doubtful, came up to London, and Pratt insisted that in respect of one of those bills of 2000*l.* which had just become due, as Palmer could not pay it, he should pay instalments upon it in addition to the enormous interest which he charged; and it was agreed at that interview of the

22nd of October, that 250*l.* should be paid down, 250*l.* paid on the 31st of October, and that as soon after as possible a further sum of 300*l.* should be paid, making in the whole a payment on account of that bill of 800*l.* to quiet Pratt, or, as Pratt said, to quiet his clients, and induce them to let the bill stand over. On the 9th of November that 300*l.* was paid, and when paid a letter was written, which I beg your particular attention to, and you will see how closely and strongly it bears on the point to which I am now entreating your most anxious consideration—a letter of the 13th of November, that is, the day when Polestar won the race, written by Pratt to Palmer, as follows:—"I count most positively on seeing you on Saturday; do for both our sakes try to make up the amount to a thousand pounds, for without it I shall be unable to renew the 1500*l.* due on the 9th." What does that mean? Pratt told us yesterday the three sums of 300*l.*, 250*l.*, and 250*l.*, and some other small amount making up the sum of 800*l.*, were instalments payable on the bill overdue, and upon which Pratt had threatened to issue writs against Palmer's mother, and Palmer had gone almost down on his knees to beg him not to do so; he said, "For God's sake, do not think of writs." Now, that 800*l.* being paid, Pratt said, "I shall only credit you for 600*l.*, I must take 200*l.* for the interest." In his letter of the 13th of November he says, "Do for both our sakes try and make up the amount to a thousand"—that is, make the 800*l.* up to a thousand pounds—"for without it I shall be unable to renew the 1500*l.*" I must have a larger instalment, or else I cannot keep this bill afloat for you. He said

so ; whether it was true or not does not matter in this case ; that was the representation which he made, and the duress which he put on Palmer ; and in truth it meant this—make it up to a thousand, give me 200*l.* more, or the writ shall be served on your mother. He does not say so, but he said something to the same effect before, and it was a representation that he could not satisfy the people whom he said he represented without that additional sum. Observe, that letter is written on the 13th of November, and Palmer gets it at Rugeley when he arrives on that evening from the races at which Polestar won. Palmer, who was at the races the first day, went away in the evening, and went to Rugeley ; when he gets to Rugeley, early in the morning of the 14th, the next day probably, he gets this letter of Pratt's, pressing on him the necessity of paying a further sum of 200*l.* What does he do ? See if it is possible to doubt that at that time Cook's life was of the utmost value to him. He instantly returns to Shrewsbury, he sees Cook. They say he dosed him. We will see how probable that is presently. He gets there on the Wednesday, he sees Cook. Cook goes to bed in a state which I will not at present describe ; he gets up much more sensible than he went to bed ; goes upon the race-course, and comes home with Palmer to Rugeley on the next day, Thursday ; he goes to bed when he gets to Rugeley ; he gets up still ill and uncomfortable, but able to go out, and he dines with Palmer that day, Friday.

Now I beg your attention to this letter. On that day, the 16th, Palmer writes thus to Pratt:—"I am obliged to come to Tattersall's on Monday to the settling, so that

I shall not call and see you before Monday, but a friend of mine will call and leave you 200*l.* to-morrow, and I will give you the remainder on Monday." That is written on the 16th, the day they dine together at Palmer's house. Now, you recollect that the person who ordinarily settled Cook's accounts in racing transactions was a person of the name of Fisher, the wine-merchant, in Shoe Lane. He was called as the first witness on this trial. That very day Cook writes to Fisher as follows:—"It is of very great importance to both Palmer and myself that a sum of 500*l.* should be paid to a Mr. Pratt, of 5, Queen Street, May Fair, to-morrow without fail ; 300*l.* has been sent up to-night, and if you would be kind enough to pay the other 200*l.* to-morrow on the receipt of this, you will greatly oblige me, and I will give it to you on Monday at Tattersall's." Then there is a postscript, which I will read, but make no comment upon it now: "I am much better." What is the fair inference from those two letters ? I submit to you that the inference is, that at that date Cook was making himself very useful to Palmer. Pratt was pressing him for an additional sum of 200*l.* when he had need of all his money, and Palmer having communicated his difficulty to Mr. Cook, Cook at once comes forward and writes to his agent to pay that 200*l.* And the letter shows more ; you may have forgotten that letter, but it was read in the first hour after the speech of my learned friend the Attorney-General ; you may have forgotten it, but I read it to you word for word—the passage "300*l.* has been sent up to-night," shows that Cook knew all about it, and probably had an in-

terest in Palmer's transactions with Mr. Pratt; it was inserted merely for the purpose of putting a good face upon it to Mr. Pratt, as a man does who, not having a farthing of the sum that he wants to pay, will pretend that he has to pay more, in order to represent that he has got a portion of what he wants to pay, and he says: "Will you lend me a little more; I am not entirely dependent upon you for the sum that I have to pay;" or it means that on that day 300*l.*, which had come to their hands in some way or other, was by Cook made applicable to the convenience of Palmer—one of those things it means: whichever way you take it, it proves to demonstration that Palmer and Cook were playing into each other's hands in respect of that heavy incumbrance upon Palmer; and that Palmer could rely upon Cook as a fast friend in any such little difficulty as that; and though his difficulties sound large when we talk of 11,500*l.*, the difficulty of the day was nothing like that, because in the spendthrift, reckless way in which they were living, putting off bills from month to month, and paying what sounds an enormous interest per annum, the actual outlay on the day was not always so considerable. I submit to you that letter shows that, on the 16th of November, when they say he was poisoning Cook, Cook was behaving to him in the most friendly way—was acquainted with his circumstances, willing to assist in the relief of his embarrassments, and actually to devote a portion of his winnings to the purposes of Palmer. It is perfectly plain, but I will make it plainer if you will attend to me for a moment longer. You will remember that part of the case of my friend is this:—he says

that he intended to defraud Cook; that Palmer having left Cook ill in bed at Rugeley, ran up to town on the Monday, intending to despatch him on the Monday night or the Tuesday; that he ran up to town, went, not to Fisher, who was the agent of Cook, but to Herring, who was his own agent, and told Herring that he was authorised by Cook to settle his Shrewsbury transactions at Tattersall's, thereby getting command over Cook's winnings; that he applied them to his own purposes, and, having done so, determined to put Cook out of the way—that is their case. We had the evidence of Fisher on the first day—Fisher is evidently a shrewd intelligent man, no friend of Palmer's—he gave, I do not mean to say improperly, I do not wish to throw imputations, but he gave a twist to the dosing at Shrewsbury against Palmer. On the Monday, as on the Tuesday, Cook, though generally indisposed, was, during great part of the day, quite well, according to the evidence; on the Monday he saw his trainer Saunders, he saw his two jockeys; he got up and was shaved; he was comfortable the whole day, and the theory is that he was comfortable because Palmer was not there to dose him—you will see how grossly absurd it is presently. He was well on the Monday, quite well on the Tuesday. Now, if Palmer had gone up to London, representing that he would do Cook's business for him through Cook's own agent, Fisher, Palmer might be perfectly certain if that was done on the Monday, Fisher would write to Cook on that night to say that the thing was done and made straight. Herring, you see, does do it the moment the thing is settled between Palmer and Herring; Her-

ring represents Palmer as saying, "You must write me word about some part of the transactions;" he says, "No, I shall write Mr. Cook word at Rugeley." Do not you think Fisher would have done the same? and if Cook had not known that Palmer intended not to go to Fisher, but to Herring, do you not think Cook would have been surprised on the Tuesday morning at not hearing that he had seen Palmer, and that the transactions were settled? could Palmer, as a man of business, have relied upon Cook's not being alarmed at Fisher's not doing it? We had the evidence of Fisher, who says, "On the 17th of November, at Cook's request, I paid 200*l.* to Mr. Pratt; his account in the ordinary course would have been settled at Tattersall's on Monday, the 19th. I advanced the 200*l.* to pay Pratt; I knew that Cook had won at Shrewsbury, and I should have been entitled to have deducted that 200*l.* from his winnings if I had settled his account at Tattersall's; I did not settle the account." That explains the whole transaction. Cook and Palmer understood each other perfectly well; it was the interest of both of them that Palmer should be relieved from the difficulty of the pressure of Pratt, and accordingly Cook said, "As to the settlement, it shall not go through Fisher; we will have the 200*l.* from Fisher; it shall not be paid to him on Monday; I will let Palmer go up and settle the whole thing through Herring." And that is what was done; and accordingly Fisher has never been paid since.

Now there is a letter to which I will call your attention, of the 19th November, 1855, from Palmer to Pratt—"Dear Sir,—You will place the 50*l.* I have just paid you, and the 450*l.* you will receive

from Mr. Herring, together 500*l.*, and the 200*l.* you received on Saturday," that is, the 200*l.* that Fisher paid to Pratt at the express request of Cook, "towards payment of my mother's acceptance for 2000*l.*, due 25th October, making paid to this day the sum of 1300*l.*" Can you doubt when you take all that together—the dining together on the Friday—Cook writing that letter to Fisher, saying it was of the greatest importance to him as well as to Palmer that the 200*l.* should be paid in order to pacify Pratt—can you doubt that on that day Cook was a most convenient friend to Palmer, and that he could not by possibility do without him? But it does not end there. Cook died on the Wednesday morning early, the 21st; if we want to know what effect that death had on Palmer, and what interest he had in it, Palmer's mouth being sealed, we must get it from Pratt. Nobody else that we know knows anything about it; Cook is gone. On the 22nd November, the day after the death,—and I am sure you will make some allowance for a day having elapsed after the death of Cook before he wrote—Palmer writes thus to Pratt:—"Ever since I saw you I have been fully engaged with Cook and not able to leave him." Now unless he murdered him, that is the truest sentence that ever was expressed. He watched the bedside of his friend; he was with him night and day; he attended him as a brother; he called his friends around him; he did all that the most affectionate solicitude could do for a friend that was ill, unless he was plotting his death—"And I am sorry to say after all he died this day, so that you had better write to Saunders;

but mind, I must have Polestar if it can be so arranged ; and should any one call upon you to know what moneys Cook ever had from you, do not answer the question." Then he says, " I sat up two full nights with Cook." That he sat up the whole of the night may not be true, but he was ready to be called if Cook should be ill ; and Elizabeth Mills says after the first serious paroxysm, when she went to bed, she left Palmer in the arm-chair, sleeping by the man whom they say he intended to murder. No ! murderers do not sleep by their victims in that way. What is the answer ? I read it to you in order that you may see what ruin Cook's death brought upon Palmer. The answer of Pratt is,—and you will see how much it increased the difficulties of Palmer—" I have your note, and am greatly disappointed at the non-receipt of the money as promised, and at the vague assurance as to any money. I can understand that your being detained by the illness of your friend has been the cause of your not sending up the amount." Attend to this paragraph :—" The death of Mr. Cook will now compel you to look about as to the payment of the bill for 500*l.*, due the 2nd of December. I have written to Saunders, informing him of my claim, and requesting to know by return what claim he had for keep and training ;" so that the very first effect of Cook's death was, in Pratt's opinion, who knew all about it, to saddle Palmer alone with the sum of 500*l.* He says, " The death of Cook will now compel you to look about as to the payment of the bill for 500*l.* on the 2nd of December." We will investigate the transaction out of which that bill arose, and

you will see, I venture to say, that I can satisfy you conclusively that the transaction out of which that bill arose was a transaction for Cook's accommodation, for which Palmer had lent his name to accommodate Cook, and for which upon Cook's death Palmer became primarily and alone responsible. It will be for you to judge, if I prove that to you, whether it suited Palmer at that moment to stand before the holder of that 500*l.* bill—some client of Pratt's—as the only man liable upon it, and whether there was the same chance, supposing it had been for his own accommodation, of putting it on, as they call it, after Cook's death, as there might have been before. But let me be fair to the prosecution, and state to you now the view that the Attorney-General takes of that 500*l.* transaction. I will read to you from my friend's speech, with reference to the 500*l.* bill transaction ; and, as I understand it, it is the greatest mistake that was ever committed, and would not stand for a moment but for the popular prejudice against Palmer. I think I can satisfy you that is so :—" Pratt still declining to advance the money"—that is, the 1000*l.* which Palmer wanted him to advance—" Pratt proposed an assignment by Cook of two race-horses, one called Polestar, which won the Shrewsbury races, and another called Sirius. That assignment was afterwards executed by Mr. Cook in favour of Pratt, and Cook was entitled to the money raised on that security, which realised 375*l.* in cash and a wine warrant." They twist it in this way, that Palmer, having forged the endorsement of Cook, and being afraid of detection, put Mr. Cook out of the way. That is the view they take of that case.

I think I can satisfy you it is impossible that that can be the correct view—it cannot, by any possibility, as it seems to me—it is for you to judge. We know exactly what took place; we had it from Pratt yesterday. What took place was this:—Palmer applied for the loan of 1000*l.*; Pratt said, “I can’t let you have it.” Palmer said, “Will you discount a bill for 500*l.*?” Pratt said, “Not without security.” Palmer said, “What security will you take? it is for the accommodation of Mr. Cook; I have undertaken to get the enclosed bill cashed for Mr. Cook; you had a 200*l.* bill of his.” He reminds him that he had been paid a 200*l.* bill, and he says, “He is a very good and responsible man; will you do it. and I will put my name to the bill?” So that it was represented to Pratt as a transaction for the accommodation of Cook; and Pratt’s answer is, “If Mr. Cook chooses to give me his security I have no objection, but he must execute a bill of sale of his two race-horses, Polestar and Sirius, and he must execute a power of attorney, and his signature to it must be attested by some solicitor in the country, so that I may be quite sure that it is really a valid security; and upon those terms, if you will get all that done, and Mr. Cook will submit to all that, I will give him 375*l.* in money, 65*l.* wine warrant, charging him 10*l.* for expenses and 50*l.* for discount,”—making up the sum of 500*l.*; that is what Pratt is willing to do. There is no doubt at all, you know, that Cook attached the highest value to Polestar; he was not going to execute a bill of sale with a power of attorney to enable the mortgagee or assignee to en-

force it at once; he was not going to do that, and not get any money for doing it; he knew the value of Polestar and Sirius; Polestar was probably backed for the engagements on which he won the money at Shrewsbury. My friend says he never received that 375*l.*; it is in the last degree improbable that he never received that money; I put it to you as men of sense that he must have received it; do you think that he remained after executing the bill of sale on the 6th of September the whole time from that day to his death without writing to Pratt —“Why, you have the bill of sale of my two horses, and I have not got any money upon them?” Is it credible, can you believe Cook, who was as much in want of money as Palmer, do you think he would throw away his property in that way, and let Pratt obtain from him a bill of sale and get no money upon it? It is incredible; the only pretence for setting it up is this: it is a perfectly fatal one that will not stand before sensible men for a minute:—Along with the cheque for 375*l.* he sent 315*l.* to Palmer for his own purposes; but my friend says Palmer having got this cheque for 375*l.* payable to order, fraudulently appropriated it to himself; forged the name of Cook upon the back of it, and kept Cook in ignorance of the transaction. Is that credible? that during three whole months Cook, who knew that he had executed a bill of sale of his two race-horses, and I will show you was in want of money, should have allowed it to remain so? Is it not much more probable that the signature of Cook was put on there with his full knowledge? It is not suggested that there was any attempt

at imitating his handwriting. Is it not more probable that Cook, who wanted the ready money, and who would probably be put to inconvenience if he did not get the ready money, but only the means of getting it two days later—that Palmer should let him have the 315*l.* cash which was sent up, and Palmer take the cheque? I will show you there is reason for believing that to be the case; I will put it to you in the first place whether it is probable he would be silent for three months? Palmer writes, “I will thank you to let me have the 315*l.* by return of post if possible; if not, send it to me by Monday night’s post to the post-office, Doncaster. I now return you Mr. Cook’s paper, and he wants the money on Saturday if he can have it; I have not promised it for Saturday, so please to enclose it with mine in cash in a registered letter, and he must pay for its being registered.” So that you see Palmer wanted it to be sent like his own, and Cook wanted it to be sent in cash. “Do not let it be later than Monday night’s post.” Pratt writes acknowledging the receipt of the document, saying he will send him his money to Doncaster, and endeavour to let Cook have his money at the same time. On the 10th of September Palmer writes to Pratt that he must send him for Mr. Cook 385*l.* instead of 375*l.* and the wine warrant, so that he can hand it to him with the 385*l.* Accordingly here is an intimation that Cook, who wanted the money on the very day, was inconvenienced by only getting a cheque on London which he could not immediately change, and therefore Palmer gave him the money and

took the cheque. It is remarkable, when we look at the banking account of Palmer at Rugeley, the 375*l.* is paid in by somebody to Palmer’s account, but the 315*l.* is not paid into Palmer’s account at all; that is the only sum paid in on that day, so that I put it to you upon these facts, Pratt saying in a letter which accompanies the money, “I am obliged to send a cheque for Mr. Cook, for I have not received the money, which I shall do no doubt to-morrow;” so that not being able to send cash to the full amount he is obliged to do that which did not suit Cook; he sent him a cheque which he could not cash on the day he got it; he is obliged to send it to London unless he could find some friend down there, and that delays him for a whole day. I submit to you as the true version of the transaction that the bill was accepted for Cook’s accommodation; Cook gave as a security for it the two horses Polestar and Sirius; Cook never complained to Pratt during the rest of his life that he had not received the money upon it. It appears in the correspondence that Cook wanted the ready money, and that he wanted it on Saturday, and it would be probably inconvenient if he had got it a bit later than Monday; though Palmer would not promise to get it sooner than Tuesday. What says Palmer in his letter, which is not written for the purpose of this case, but written at the date of this transaction? that he, Palmer, would let Cook have the cash that was sent, and he himself take the cheque with Cook’s authority, and put Cook’s name on the back of it; and how else can you account for the silence of Cook, for the fact that

the 375*l.* is paid into the account of Palmer at Rugeley, and no trace of the other large sum of 315*l.*? That is well worthy your consideration. You cannot account by any reasonable mode for the fact that the security given for that 500*l.* was Cook's horses, and Cook remaining quiet about it for three months after he had executed a regular bill of sale, except the supposition that it was for Cook's accommodation, and Cook got the best part of the money; and if so, Palmer's name being on the bill, what is the effect of Cook's death? Gentlemen, what Pratt, who knew all about it, says is: "the death of Cook makes you liable for that sum of 500*l.* due on the 2nd December." I submit to you on the second ground of motive, which my learned friend suggested, the case has altogether failed, and that it is perfectly clear that at the date of Cook's death Pratt was of opinion that the death of Cook threw a further liability on Palmer of 500*l.*; he tells him so in that letter. How could it be his interest to kill him?

Just see another transaction of that date; it is not quite so clear, as it strikes me, but yet it makes it to my mind exceedingly improbable that Palmer should have desired the death of Cook. Exceedingly improbable! Mr. Wetherby told us to-day that though frequently stakes won at a race were sent up by the clerk of the course to the winner's bankers within a week, it was not always so, and it would not be a matter of complaint if it was not. On the 20th of November, the day before Cook dies, and on which he was perfectly comfortable and happy, enjoying

the society of his friend Mr. Jones, with whom he was on terms of the greatest intimacy, and to whom he could confide any troubles that he had, and who appears to be a gentleman in every way respectable and intelligent—on that day Cook was well, and Mr. Jones was with him, and there is no doubt that on that day, according to the evidence of Mr. Wetherby, he did sign and give this cheque for 350*l.* If Palmer killed him that night, and by any chance the 350*l.* should not have been sent up by Mr. Frail, so as to be there on the next morning, he, Mr. Wetherby, would not pay that cheque, and would never pay it after notice of Cook's death, though the money should come up: he never did pay it. The end of that transaction was this, that Mr. Frail did not send it up, but made a claim upon Cook in respect of it. Cook's executors disputed that, and Cook's executors finally recovered the money, but they did not send it up to Mr. Wetherby. I do not put it as strong as the other case, because Palmer might think that the money would be there; but he also might think that it would not be there. It is not at all likely that, having got the cheque of 350*l.* from Cook, he would run the risk of losing that money by destroying him in the night, Cook's friends being there, and sure to institute an immediate inquiry into his affairs. Is that probable? I submit to you it is not. It does not end there: we know from Herring that at that very time Herring held one bill for 500*l.* on which Cook's name was, and another bill of 500*l.*, which my friend stated and gave proof was not in the signature of Mrs. Palmer. So that there was a bill for 500*l.*, not in her hand-writing, to

which Cook was a party, for all of which Cook, either in whole or in part, unless he rushed upon his own ruin, must provide; in respect of which, for the accommodation of Palmer or not, Palmer could go to Cook and say, "Now, Cook, it is true enough all these bills are for my accommodation, but what is the use of your making a fuss about that? if I cannot pay, you must, or your stud will be sold up; had you not better give your name to some more bills and make it easy? If he put Cook to death that was gone. Again, in addition to the 500*l.* bill, for which the bill of sale on Sirius and Polestar was given, the bill for 500*l.* held by Herring was a forgery, according to their case, which there would be no excuse for not meeting; a 500*l.* bill in the hands of a man who wants the money is not so easily put on; that 500*l.* bill would very soon find its way to his mother. It would not have suited Palmer that his mother should know—his mother was a woman of large fortune, a respectable person I am told—she disliked his gambling propensities, though she liked her son; neither did the excellent and most honourable man his brother, before me, who stands by him now, but who was estranged from him simply because he disapproved of his gambling; neither would he have given to him any countenance. If Palmer was pressed to pay that 500*l.*, and Cook was dead, there was nothing to save him from the exposure. Nothing! If you doubt what I say is the truth, look through the whole of the case, find me in any portion of this most voluminous evidence the slightest trace that there was a man in the world who would lend his name to Palmer to enable him to get money. Is not the fact

that he forged, if he did forge, the name of his mother, conclusive that he had no other resource? Is there the least trace of evidence that he had any other resource than the good-nature, the easiness, perhaps the folly of Cook, who could have renewed these bills for him, the three 200*l.* bills and the 500*l.*, and put them on, as they say? and was it not quite certain that if Cook, the acceptor of them, dropped, the claim would come upon Cook's executors, and then the executors would ascertain all about it and sell him up? When you come to think of it, is it credible that the man under these circumstances should desire to bring not merely the creditors and executors of Cook, who might be supposed, though Mr. Stephens is not one of that class, to have some pity for Cook's friend, but men of business, down upon him, who have no right to have any pity? A man dies, his affairs are put into the hands of solicitors; they have a plain duty to perform, they cannot be compassionate, they must be just; they must see the rights of their clients, the executors, established in due course of law, and compromise and arrangement with them is wholly out of the question. Can you find in any part of this case a single living person who was willing to have done for Palmer what Cook had been doing for him for two or three years? Does it appear that there was one? Does it appear that Cook was a close-fisted fellow, and did not care to do Palmer a turn? When Palmer needed the 200*l.*, which the harpy wanted from him, Cook at once wrote and said, it is a matter of great importance to him as well as Palmer that this 200*l.* should be paid; and he even risked the dis-

pleasure of Fisher in doing it. Then again Cook was in his senses perfectly on the Tuesday. He cannot have been very rich at that time. He gave him the cheque for 350*l*. How is it possible to conceive that under those circumstances Palmer should have an interest in the death of Cook? and yet what is the theory of the Crown?—that Palmer was convinced that he could settle his affairs as to Cook better with Mr. Stephens than he could with Cook himself—settle these word-of-honour transactions; these things, half of which would not bear inquiry in any way as reasonable business transactions, with a shrewd and probably a penurious man—deliberately thought that it would answer his purpose better to come in contact with his executor, Mr. Stephens, whom Mr. Jones might rush up to town and bring down with him. I submit to you with confidence, though what I say may be inconsistent with the views generally entertained by the public—the public, however, have never had an opportunity of looking at all these letters—but it seems to me as clear as anything can be, that it was the manifest interest of Palmer that Cook should live.

But in addition to its being his interest that he should live, was it safe for him that he should die? Palmer was a man who added to a shrewd knowledge of the world a knowledge of his profession, and among other things a knowledge of chemistry. It is plain from the book put in by the Attorney-General that he knew the effect of strychnia; that it produces horrible convulsions; and he knew that if he put Cook to death by means of strychnia, it would be the talk of a small place like Ruge-

ley; that it was certain to end in detection, and probably conviction. If that was so, was he so circumstanced at that time as to make it safe for him to run the risk of such suspicions? His brother Walter Palmer had died in the month of August, and his only hope, unless his mother forgave him, or recognised those acceptances, his only hope of extrication from his difficulties, was the getting the amount due by the Prince of Wales Insurance Company to him as the assignee of the policy on Walter Palmer's life; that was his only chance, he had a chance that way, and it is plain that it was so good a chance, as I will show you presently, that he refused an offer of return of premium from the Company; it does not appear what the amount was,—and Pratt, who was his attorney, believed the chance to be so good, that he had actually got the discounts of these large sums of money upon it, and had resolved, under the directions of Palmer, to put it in suit. It was really the only unpledged property he had, and how was he situated respecting it? It is plain from the letters which were put in yesterday, and it is further plain from the evidence of Mr. Deane, the solicitor to the Prince of Wales Insurance Office, that inquiries had been made by the officers Todd and Simpson, as to the circumstances of the death of Walter Palmer, and that the prisoner Palmer was aware of these inquiries. So that you see just before the death of Cook, Palmer knew himself to be an object of suspicion, but he acted as if he thought it was the most unfounded and unwarrantable suspicion, putting the policy of insurance into the hands of an attorney to enforce payment of it, and the office meet-

ing the claim by insinuations and inquiries which were of a nature to destroy his character and to bring around his head the suspicion of another murder. [The learned Serjeant proceeded to state that, although Pratt stated that he had no doubt he should compel the office to pay, their refusal altered the state of affairs, and that Palmer must be prepared to cover his mother's acceptances for 4000*l.*, due at the end of the month.] "In any event bear in mind that you must be prepared to cover your mother's acceptances for the 4000*l.* due at the end of the month;" there was the pinch, the office would not pay, the 4000*l.* was becoming due, the holder of the bills saw he was without security, and if anything occurred to increase the suspicions of the insurance office, which was very reluctant to pay, the 13,000*l.* was lost for ever, lost beyond all hope. Gentlemen, that 13,000*l.* is sure to be paid unless that man is convicted of murder; and that has a great deal to do with the clamour and alarm which have been excited; so sure as that man is saved, and saved, I believe, he will be, that 13,000*l.* is paid; there is no defence, no pretence for a defence; the letters of the office make that plain; they took an enormous premium—knowing that the man was only thirty, they took a premium for a man of fifty; at least the letters which were put in show that the premium was enormous; and I say that as sure as he is saved that 13,000*l.* is good for him, and will pay all his creditors. Do not these facts show that in this October, suspicions were hanging in menacing meteors about Palmer's head, which would come down with irresistible momentum

and crush him upon suspicion of a sudden death by murder. Do you believe that a man who wrote what the effects of strychnia were in his manual would risk such a scene as a death-bed by strychnia, in the presence of the dearest and best friend of Cook—a man whom he could not influence, a medical man, who liked him and loved him well enough when he knew he was ill to sleep with him in the same room that he might be ready to attend to him in case he wanted assistance during the night? Is that common sense? are you going to endorse such a theory as that upon the suggestion of Dr. Alfred Taylor about the effects that strychnia produced upon his five rabbits? Impossible! perfectly impossible! as I submit to you. So sure as anything happened by foul play to Cook, he had no more chance of getting the 13,000*l.* than 130,000*l.* from the Prince of Wales Insurance Office,—none whatever. That was the only means he had at that time of extricating himself from those incumbrances.

Gentlemen, I have detained you a long time upon this, but not, I trust, too long, if the view I have submitted be one worthy of your consideration. I infer from all this, that Palmer had no interest whatever to put Cook to death; that it was contrary to his interest in a pecuniary point of view, and brought claims upon him, some of them small, others of a larger amount, of which he might have shared the liability with Cook, if not have thrown it entirely upon Cook; that it forced an immediate settlement of the affairs of Cook, not with Cook himself, who was an easy man probably—it is plain he was from these documents—but with

hard and exacting executors and their solicitors, and that therefore in a pecuniary sense he had every motive of interest to desire that Cook should live ; and further he had no chance of getting a ready payment of the 13,000*l.*, no chance of the sudden death of Cook passing without suspicion and inquiry, and therefore he could not think it safe for him that he should die. It could not be the interest of Palmer that Cook should die.

I now proceed to the next head ; and it is impossible in dealing with this evidence, to observe altogether the order of date ; I must group the facts as well as I can, in order to deal with the whole of the evidence. The question is, whether the symptoms of Cook before his death, and the appearances presented by his body after death, were consistent with the theory of his having died by strychnia poison, and inconsistent with the theory of his having died from other and natural causes. It is under this head, gentlemen, that I shall discuss, I hope not at undue length, the medical evidence in this cause, and present to you such observations as occur to me, upon the witnesses who have been called to support the view which the Crown takes of the effect of that medical evidence. For this purpose, let us briefly, in a sentence or two, run over the facts : Cook died on Wednesday morning, the 21st of November, at one o'clock, in violent convulsions ; he died in the presence of Mr. Jones. It was no sooner light, than Jones posted up to town to see Cook's stepfather and executor Mr. Stephens, who came down and was introduced to Palmer. Palmer took him up to the corpse and uncovered the corpse to the thighs—brave man he must have been if he was a murderer, to do that—uncovered

the corpse to the thighs before him. Stephens observed the body, and wondered he could have died, he looked so calm, so composed, so well, so little emaciated ; he observed indeed some slight rigidity about the muscles. He took his hand and wondered that he should have died ; his suspicions were immediately aroused. He dined that day at Rugeley, and asked Palmer to dinner with him, and questioned him about the betting-book ; got angry that it was not produced, dissembled with Palmer, cross-examined him, went up to town, met him afterwards at the station at Euston Square, afterwards at Rugby, afterwards at Wolverton ; again at Rugeley ; and at last threw off the mask, and addressing him in a tone to which I shall call your attention presently, gave Palmer clearly to understand that he suspected him, and intended to probe the whole matter to the very core. He resolved upon a *post-mortem* examination, and a *post-mortem* examination took place. The appearances which were presented at the death of Cook, were such as might have been expected by those who had been acquainted with his course of life and his general health, his pursuits—it is a pity to say anything hard of him—his vices—I will not say more than that—his vices, and the company, the drinking, idle, racing company, which he kept. His father had died at the age of thirty, his mother about the same age, a year or two after she had married Mr. Stephens ; his brother was delicate, his sister was delicate ; he was believed by his physicians to have something of a pulmonary complaint, and, when his body was opened, his lungs were found to be emphysematous, that is, their air-vessels were distended with air. On further in-

quiry, for I take both the examinations together, it was found that for a length of time he had been troubled with a very ugly sore throat—a sore throat bad enough to render it necessary that it should be constantly touched with caustic as well as his tongue; he would not have been able to swallow without it. The tonsils of his throat were at the very time he left for the Shrewsbury races, though much better than they had been, sore and inflamed—one of them was very nearly gone, the other was very much reduced in size; and he knew so much better about himself and the cause of it all probably than his medical adviser, that he very much preferred mercury to any other specific for his complaint. He had, besides that, traces about his person which have been so often referred to, the result of disease, that they need not be more particularly mentioned than they have been already, as to the extent of which and the character of which some little doubt exists; but they did not come by an ordinary and chaste mode of life, you may depend upon it; and, altogether, as far as it went, he seems to have been about as loose a young man as one is in the habit of meeting, without being utterly lost to all sense of honour and propriety, which I do not mean to suggest that he was. His body was opened; the soreness of his tongue was manifest; I rather collect that it was not actually sore at the time of his death—yet that there were what they call follicles, and symptoms, if not recent at least not very ancient, of actual ulcers; the inside of his mouth, too, had been ulcerated, or the skin taken off by some sort of soreness attributed to decayed teeth. We all of us, pro-

bably, have decayed teeth; but that does not happen to us which happened to him: it was sore on both sides. The sores about his mouth he thought himself were syphilitic, and could not be persuaded by that very respectable gentleman, Dr. Savage, to attend readily to his advice. He thought he was not weak enough, I think he said fool enough, to take quack medicines; but weak enough to take the advice of any medical quack who had assurance enough to give advice to him, believing that the best thing for his complaint was mercury; and he was apprehensive, I believe, that what are the worst symptoms of that disease for which mercury is given, namely, spots upon the body, would make their appearance, and that possibly (I believe such things do happen) some day or other he would find on the morning of a race his face covered with large copper-coloured blotches, which would plainly show what life he had been leading. That was the sort of man he was. Many such a man has reformed, and become a good and respectable member of society: I should be sorry to say anything unduly harsh upon a man who is gone; but the state of his health is a material subject for our inquiry here. It is plain that he had in his own opinion been affected by virulent syphilis, and that that had not corrected his habits, for he had become recently diseased. The medical men who attended him before concurred in this opinion; and when his body was opened, in addition to all those plainer symptoms of illness to the eye, on the second *post-mortem* examination, there was between the delicate membrane which covers the spinal marrow, and which is called the arachnoid, I believe—

I think I am right—there was pressing upon the arachnoid and embedded to some extent in the next covering, not so delicate, though still delicate, called the dura mater, granules, as given in evidence, of such extent as I will satisfy you by men competent to inform you, would, if his body had been opened in the dead-house of any hospital in this metropolis, have been said and determined to be the cause of his death.

Such was the condition of Cook, only partially discovered on the *post-mortem* examination which took place at the desire of the executor, Mr. Stephens. [The learned Serjeant then referred to the circumstances attending the examination, and that the stomach had been sent to London and submitted for examination to Dr. Taylor.] Dr. Taylor and Dr. Rees examined it; they examined it with the knowledge that there was a suspicion somewhere, arising, no doubt, from the fact that Roberts, one of the witnesses who has been called, had told, and likely enough he should tell, in a little place like Rugeley, that Palmer had bought some strychnia in his shop on the Tuesday. There was a letter sent up to Mr. Stephens, and I do not find fault at all with Mr. Stephens for communicating it to Dr. Taylor—it was quite right that he should do so: with that knowledge Dr. Taylor wrote a letter, which I think I have already in the course of my address to-day read to you, in which he attributed the death to antimony. He said it *may* have been caused, possibly, by antimony. I put an emphasis on the word “may,” because Dr. Taylor himself desires emphasis to be put upon the word “may.” He says, I did not mean to say that it was

caused by antimony, but it is possible it was caused by antimony. Now, that is the way in which Dr. Taylor desires that letter to be taken. You will judge of it.

Dr. Taylor attends the coroner's inquest, which is held in consequence, I presume, of his letter. I do not know whether that is so or not, but in consequence of suspicions entertained, and probably in consequence of the letter which he sent in answer to Mr. Stephens's inquiries, and he hears the evidence of Jones, and of Mills, and of Roberts, and of others; but I call your attention to the evidence of those three witnesses, because I think, in fairness to Dr. Taylor, it must be presumed that they principally influenced his opinion. Now, then, I say that upon the loose evidence of chambermaids, and waitresses, and housekeepers, against the opinion of the medical man who attended Cook in his last illness, or at any rate with no encouragement, as I will satisfy you presently (for there is an observation to be made upon that)—with no encouragement from the medical man, Mr. Jones, the surgeon at Lutterworth, who was of an age and character, having seen the whole illness, to form an opinion upon the matter—Dr. Taylor, having heard the evidence of Elizabeth Mills, and the evidence of Mr. Jones, and of Roberts, came at once boldly to the conclusion that his notion that antimony was the cause of death was a mistake; and he had the incredible imprudence—an imprudence which has led to all this dreadful excitement—an imprudence which has rendered it necessary that this inquiry should take place in this form and in this place, if at all—to state upon his oath before that jury that he be-

lieved that the pills which were administered to Cook on the Monday and Tuesday night contained strychnia, and that Cook was poisoned by it. The opinion, once delivered, was irrevocable. By it Dr. Taylor's reputation was staked against Palmer's life. The greatest excitement was raised throughout the country, and these proceedings became unavoidable. "A little learning is a dangerous thing." It appears to me that there never was a case in which the adage was so applicable as it is in this. Of all the works of God, the one best calculated to fill us with wonder and admiration, and convince us of our dependence on our Maker, and the utter nothingness of ourselves, is the mortal coil in which we live, and breathe, and think, and have our being. Every minute of our lives functions are performed at our will, the unerring accuracy of which nothing but Omniscience and Omnipotence could have secured. We feel and see exactly what takes place, and yet the moment we attempt to explain what takes place, the instant we endeavour to give a reason for what we know, and see, and do, the mystery of creation—"God created Man in His own image; in the image of God created he Him"—arrests our course, and we are flung back upon conjecture and doubt. We know, in a sense—we suppose—that the soft medullary substance which is within the cavity of the head is the seat of thought, of sensation, and of will. We know that that soft medullary substance is continued down the middle of the back, protected by a bony duct or canal, within which bony duct or canal it lies embedded; and we know that from the sides of this bony duct, and from this medullary substance

proceed an infinite variety of nerves (the conduits of sensation from all parts of the body to the soul), and of muscles connected and dependent on them, the instruments of voluntary motion. This we know; and we know that by that process all the ordinary actions of our lives, at our own will, are effected with the most wonderful precision. Sometimes, however, these nerves and muscles depart from their normal character, and, instead of being the mere instruments of the will of the soul, become irregular, convulsive, tumultuary, vindicating to themselves a sort of independent vitality, totally regardless of the authority to which they are ordinarily subject. When thrown into this state of irritation and excitement, their effects are known by the general name of convulsions. It is remarkable, unlike most other fine names, they are not a modern adaptation. The ancients had them to express the very same thing; the spasmodic and tetanic affections were known then, and as much about them, hundreds and thousands of years ago as is known now. Tetanic convulsions have in later times been divided into two specific branches of tetanus—idiopathic and traumatic. We have heard a great deal of these two descriptions of tetanus. One question my Lord asked, which was answered by Dr. Todd—it would have been more satisfactory if my Lord had asked what the meaning of the English of "idiopathic," viz., self-generating, was; the answer given to the question, What does idiopathic mean? was "constitutional." True, but that means nothing, or, if anything, it means "unaccountable."

Lord Campbell.—Without external injury.

Mr. Serjeant Shee.—Just so, my Lord; without external injury, but attributable to no known cause, unless in some few instances, perhaps, where there is some injury in the interior of the body; but the meaning of the word “idiopathic” is unquestionably what I have stated; not that it follows they never can be traced to a cause, but that they constantly occur in which the cause may be attributed to one thing or to another, and in that case we say that it is idiopathic tetanus, because we cannot with certainty say it is traumatic, that is, arising from any external injury. Now, gentlemen, we have had a great deal of evidence produced by my friend, directed to show—assuming that the disease of which Mr. Cook died was tetanus—that it must have been strychnia-tetanus. It is a mere assumption they begin with—the merest assumption in the world. I will give you my reasons for saying so, and I think I am justified in so saying. What pretence is there for saying the convulsions were tetanus at all? Mr. Jones was examined, and I will read to you presently what the evidence he gave was. Mr. Jones, in the copy of the depositions delivered to me, stated that Mr. Cook died of convulsions, and in the copy of the depositions which he signed and read over and corrected, there was not a word of tetanus. My learned friend interposed, and said, on looking to the original depositions, it did appear that he had mentioned it, and he said so because in the course of his examination he found a half-written word, “*tetinus*”—he availed himself of it, not unfairly, to suggest, that though he did not positively say it was tetanus, yet that what

he observed was something which put him in mind of tetanus. It bore some of the characteristics of a tetanic convulsion; but, gentlemen, it may do so, and yet not be tetanus; and I submit to you that it is bad reasoning, and I will prove it presently. I put a question to the witness on the subject. It is bad reasoning to say without positive proof of the fact that it was tetanus, and it cannot be traumatic tetanus because it did not appear it had presented the distinct features of traumatic tetanus, and therefore it must be tetanus by strychnia. That is the argument. They assume it cannot be traumatic tetanus, they have not discovered the poison, but still they say it must be tetanus by poison! Let us see whether there is any pretence for saying anything of the kind. My learned friends may tell me, if you venture to impeach the authority of a man like Dr. Taylor, who, though he had no knowledge on the subject, undoubtedly is a gentleman of great reading in his profession, and a gentleman who has written a book, which I will not treat as a book not worthy of being attended to because I think it right on this evidence to attack a particular part of it—if you choose to say his opinion is not to be depended upon, it is incumbent on you to suggest some other theory of the cause of Cook's death which will explain the evidence given, and prove not merely negatively it is not what we say it was, but prove affirmatively it is something else. I say I am not called on to do any such thing. The Crown is the party, or rather those out of whose hands this case has been taken by the Crown, who have thought proper to impute the death of this gentle-

man to the poison of strychnia; they have followed the trail which has been dragged before them by these toxicologists; and, relying on their judgment and discretion, they have made quite sure they will be enabled to establish the fact that it was not either by traumatic or idiopathic tetanus, but by tetanus of strychnia, that he had died. I say I am not bound to suggest any theory upon the subject. It cannot be expected that in the defence I should do so, and, in point of logic, it is not reasonable, when we contradict the fact which it is for them to prove, that our denial of that fact and our reasons should be weakened because we cannot conclusively fix the cause of death, or explain the cause of death in any other way. If we can satisfy you that in any one of the numerous varieties of convulsions this gentleman might have fallen, and might have been either asphyxiated, or by some sudden spasm deprived of life in a way different from asphyxia,—it is quite enough for us to prove the probability of that, unless they show conclusively that the circumstances and symptoms which attended his death are irreconcilable with any other theory than that of strychnia poison. Let us see what the symptoms were. What I propose to do is to call your attention to the statement of Elizabeth Mills and Mr. Jones before the coroner of the symptoms they observed in Cook on the Monday and Tuesday nights; and having done so, without accepting any challenge which may be made by my friend to account for the symptoms, I will submit to your judgment, on authority which cannot deceive you, whether those symptoms are not more probably

accounted for by the convulsions which are not tetanic at all, and certainly not tetanic in its distinct character of strychnia tetanus, but to be classed under those general convulsions by which it constantly pleases Providence to strike man down without leaving a trace of their course in his system. Gentlemen, what I submit to you is this, that the symptoms described in the depositions of Elizabeth Mills and Mr. Jones were such as to make it quite unjustifiable to resort to the hypothesis of tetanus of any kind, much less of strychnia tetanus. You will recollect—I will not repeat it—the peculiarity of the constitution of this young man, and the evidence of occasional functional disarrangement, not particularly at that time, which involve grave consequences, to which I have already called your attention. I submit to you, on the authorities on matters of this kind, it is much more probable that Cook died in general convulsions not tetanic at all, than that he died from idiopathic, traumatic, or strychnia tetanus. I have mentioned all that I intend to say about his bodily infirmities: let us now see what has been the state of his mind. He went to the Shrewsbury races in imminent peril of leaving them a ruined man. We know, from the necessity under which he was to raise sums of money at exorbitant interest, that he must have been in circumstances of the utmost embarrassment—that it was impossible, morally speaking, unless some wonderful success on the turf restored his fortunes, that he could stand his ground at all; and it is this state of mind, and with health, at all events, not strong, and a constitution exceed-

ingly delicate, that he had been for a length of time cherishing the hope that Polestar, which was hardly his, for it was mortgaged, and which must become another person's if it did not win at Shrewsbury—in all reasonable probability he had been cherishing the hope that Polestar would win, and that he by that winning would possess himself at once of the stakes, which my learned friend stated, and I think it was proved, amounted to nearly 400*l.*, besides some considerable winnings to the amount of 600*l.* or 700*l.* by bets on the mare—upwards of 1000*l.* altogether. That has been mentioned several times. Fancy the condition in which that young man rose from his bed on the Tuesday morning. He must have known and felt when he went down to breakfast, “This night I am either a beggar, or a man with hopes of recovering myself, and with the means, at least for the time, of keeping up my appearance of respectability.” He goes to the races: another race takes place before his mare, Polestar, is brought to the goal. He waits for it in a state of feverish anxiety and expectation—the hour that intervenes appears to him everlasting. At last the horses start, and his mare wins easily: he is the winner of 1000*l.* What effect has it upon him? Mr. Jones tells us the effect. He is unable to speak for three minutes. He is saved, not merely in purse, but in honour and character—saved before his relatives and friends. He will not be a disgrace to them yet, at all events; he may retrieve his fortunes, and become an honourable and respectable man. Conceive him to be a man with right feelings—and it is not because a man falls into the ways of promiscuous licen-

tiousness that he is devoid of all honourable feeling—conceive him to be an honourable man, a man who loved the memory of his father and his mother, who valued the respectability of his family, and who had a desire to appear before his sister, Mrs. Bradford, as an honourable man, instead of being known to her as a levanter and a blackleg, driven from all honourable society. The effect of his success is, that for three minutes he cannot speak, though he is with his intimate friend Mr. Jones. He goes back to the inn, though he has to some extent recovered himself, in a state of elation, and with a revulsion from the despair in which he was, which must have convulsed, though not in a sense of immediate illness, every fibre of his frame. His first and his natural inclination was to entertain his friends, and he gives a champagne dinner. The evidence is, that he did not drink to excess; that is the evidence; but he had champagne, and we all of us know that when there is champagne there are other things besides, and it very often happens it is not because champagne is drunk the company do not drink as much of other wines. What in ordinary parlance is called a champagne dinner is a good, luxurious entertainment, in which there is no stint and not much self-restraint. I do not mean to say he was drunk. The evidence is he rose from table not drunk, and therefore it is not for me to say, and the evidence will not justify me in saying, he was. That evening he did not spend in the company of Jones. I do not think it is very clear in whose company he spent it after the dinner was over; but we find him the next night, Wednesday,

at the Unicorn, with Saunders, the trainer, Mr. Palmer, and a lady. The next morning is cold and wet. He went on the ground, and was observed by Herring standing in the wet, and remonstrated with for so doing. He was taken ill that night, and you will hear what his symptoms were. I shall call your attention to those under the third head of what I have to address to you. He sent for a doctor, who recommends an emetic. The poor man seemed to know more about it than the doctor. He said he could do it with hot water and a tooth-brush. Perhaps he had often relieved his stomach in that way. He was unwell that day, and was ailing till his death at Rugeley. That is the general history, as far as the mental excitement can be referred to: great reason to apprehend ruin when he went to Shrewsbury; immediate, sudden, yet only partial recovery from his embarrassments at Shrewsbury; and home to Rugeley to meet them again in their full intensity—all the winnings, and twice the sum, to save him from the ruin he had brought on himself. All the property he appears to have had at the time were Polestar and Sirius, and they were mortgaged for debts due to Pratt. He may have had some few hundreds in money. It is with a weakened body and an irritated and excited mind that he is affected with a sickness at Shrewsbury, which clings to a system incapable of being recruited by the ordinary necessary food, without which the strongest man gives way, excites his nerves, and makes him in imminent danger of falling a victim to any convulsive attacks to which his constitution would be likely to be disposed. Depend upon it the thoughts of

that young man, when he retired to bed, were not the thoughts with which you lay your heads upon the pillow. He had much to think of which he regretted, much to deliberate upon which was of a nature to excite in his mind the most serious apprehensions. There was neither credit, nor honour, nor anything in his career which would make him respect himself, or respectable in the eyes of others. His rest was only imperfect at the best, and after the gratifications of the animal appetite, to which people in some instances resort to alleviate the unhappy recollections of the moment, he had no resource. He desired no society so much as the society of Palmer. His residence was at the Talbot Arms, which was, in fact, a residence with Palmer. He does not appear to have had a sitting-room to himself; he does not appear to have frequented the coffee-room. He had a bedroom at the Talbot Arms, and his real home, where he often was, and would have been nearly altogether but for his illness, was Palmer's house over the way. That was his condition at Rugeley. He is taken violently ill on Sunday night. We had nothing but his own description of it; but what is that description? He had been poorly for some time. For two nights he had been taking opium pills prescribed by Mr. Bamford. Mr. Bamford is an aged man, but there is no doubt a respectable man, and a man who would be likely, I think we may fairly infer, to consider what the complaint was, and prescribe accordingly. In the middle of the night, at twelve o'clock, he was awakened from a dream in a state of affright. He says he was nearly mad; he rang the bell, but nobody would come.

Lord Campbell.—He thought they would not hear him; he thought they had gone to bed.

Mr. Serjeant Shee.—He states he was mad for two minutes, and what did he ascribe it to. Nothing but sudden alarm by the noise of a quarrel in the street. Does that happen to us, gentlemen? Does it happen to those of us who live regular lives, and who are of good average constitution? Do we awaken in a state that we can describe as madness, and without any mode of accounting for the paroxysm but a quarrel in the street? It must have been a very high state of nervous excitement. It must have been something violent while it lasted—transient in its character; but something that arose from a disordered state of the stomach and an agitated and anxious mind, probably in some degree weakened by the medicine he was taking, the calomel and the morphia, to which he had shown a great reluctance, in which he placed little confidence, because Dr. Savage told him he ought not to take opium, and therefore he would be to some extent coerced by the opinion of Mr. Bamford.

Mr. Baron Alderson.—That was calomel.

Mr. Serjeant Shee.—It was so, my Lord. So that he was coerced, as it were, into taking something he did not like, because there was calomel in those pills. The next day, the Monday, he was well the whole day; not well in the sense of being strong and able to take a walk in the fields, or mount his horse and gallop about the country, but well in the sense of being able to get up, after trying to breakfast in bed, to talk of sending for the barber, and, I believe, actually sending for him; of seeing his

trainer and his jockeys, and discuss his plans for his next campaign: well, to that extent, but not out of his bed-room, taking no substantial food, not vomiting much that day, though a little I think in the morning, which is ascribed by the theory of the Crown, or by those whose case the Crown has been forced by public opinion or by public excitement to take up, to Palmer's absence all that day. We do not hear that Cook took anything solid. We do not hear that he lunched at 1 o'clock, and then, as most probably he was in the habit of doing, took his beef-steak and his leg of mutton, or his chicken, at 5 or 6 o'clock. He had no insuperable dislike to brandy-and-water; he could, on an occasion, take his glass or two, though Palmer was not there; but he does not appear to have been in the condition, ill as he was, to have any gratification in food or drink of any kind; and Palmer was in London all the time. Then, in the middle of the night, at 12 o'clock, he is seized with a paroxysm, which Elizabeth Mills describes. We will take her description. [The learned Serjeant here read a portion of the deposition of Elizabeth Mills.] That is the account of Cook's illness on Monday night. It might have been a much less serious fit than the one on the Sunday night. Nothing took place which could justify any man in saying that he was mad for a minute; nothing of the kind. But let us be fair. Afterwards, in talking of it, he says, speaking to Elizabeth Mills, "Did you ever see anybody in such agony as I was last night?" We have the description of Elizabeth Mills, and his own statement afterwards: "I saw him again

about 7 o'clock, and he asked me whether I ever saw anybody in such agony as he was the previous night." Not to tie the young woman down to a word, the fair inference of the whole of that statement is, that for some time during the whole of that paroxysm he was in pain, and in great pain, but that he never lost his senses. He could not very well be in such a state as that which he described on the Sunday night, for when Mr. Jones, in whom he placed the fullest reliance, having been specially sent for, had come, he did not say anything to him about it. If Cook had thought that those words which he used to Elizabeth Mills were not an exaggerated description of what had occurred, do you not think, when Mr. Jones came to see him, and felt his pulse and inquired what his symptoms were, that Cook would have said (he being in full possession of his senses), "You cannot judge now from my appearance how I am: I was in a state of madness last night; I was in the greatest possible agony; I do not know what it was; I was attacked in the middle of the night in such a way that I thought I was going to die?" As he had Mr. Jones with him, would he not have mentioned that in the conversation? My inference from that is, that in all probability this first statement of Elizabeth Mills was the correct statement of what occurred; and if we find it is consistent with what Mr. Jones says as to what occurred the next night in its general character, it would be very nearly the same on both nights. We may reasonably infer that anything in excess of that, on which the medical evidence was given, has been the result of imagination, and not

so strictly consistent with the truth as the original statement. Let us see what Mr. Jones says. [The learned Serjeant read a portion of the deposition of Mr. Jones before the coroner.] Observe the significance of that. Palmer, in the presence of Mr. Jones, brings up two pills, which it is supposed were the pills that poisoned him—pills containing a substance which sometimes does its work in a quarter of an hour, which has done it in less, but never hardly exceeds half an hour! and so we are to be asked to believe that Palmer, Jones being present, and Cook in his presence objecting to take the pills, positively forced them down his throat, at the imminent peril of his falling down, like the rabbit, in two or three minutes afterwards, in convulsions evidently and manifestly tetanic. He states what did take place. [The learned Serjeant read a further portion of Mr. Jones's deposition.] I do not think it is impossible that Mr. Jones, when he gave that evidence, had in his mind's eye what he had seen that night, and not seen very correctly. He had not light enough to see the patient's face. There was only one candle, and he could not tell whether there was any change in his countenance on the Tuesday—a very important symptom. They say it cannot have been traumatic, because there is a peculiar expression in the face—a fact which nobody observed. It was too dark, in this case of Cook's, to take notice. Mr. Jones gave his evidence, and he is a competent professional man, and it is quite clear that the notion of tetanus, or tetanic, tetaniform, or something like tetanus, must have entered into his mind, because the clerk has put down "tetinus;" he pro-

bably had not heard of the word before, and the probability is, something like it was used. He said he did use it, and afterwards it was struck out, and Mr. Jones corrected his deposition, read it all over and signed it, and left it with the word struck out. There are strong symptoms of "compression," that is one word struck out; then afterwards there is the word "tetinus," and then those two words are struck out, with Mr. Jones's entire approbation, because otherwise he would have corrected it when he signed it; and he said he read it over, and the words "violent convulsions" were substituted. What is the fair inference from that?—that the man who saw Cook in the paroxysm did not think himself justified in saying it was tetanus. It might be very like; it might have a tetaniform appearance; but it was not tetanus.

Gentlemen, I will call your attention to the features of general convulsions. I cross-examined several of the medical witnesses, for the purpose of inducing what I consider to be a true belief as to this case, that the convulsions in which Cook died were not tetanus properly speaking, or tetanic properly speaking; but that they were convulsions of that strong and violent character which are tetaniform, though not classed under idiopathic or traumatic tetanus, but under the head of general convulsions.

[The learned Serjeant proceeded to read from the works of Dr. Copland and Dr. Watson their opinions respecting all descriptions of convulsions, comparing them with the symptoms described by Mr. Jones and Elizabeth Mills.]

Now, gentlemen, having gone so

far, and having endeavoured to satisfy you that the symptoms which were spoken to by those two witnesses on the depositions may be the symptoms, as I think—that is to say, as I am told, having no experience of my own in the matter—that these symptoms are rather referable to that violent description of general convulsions than to any form of tetanus, let us go to the question, whether or not the symptoms are consistent with what we know of tetanus produced by strychnine, because, if we are satisfied on a full inquiry that they are not consistent with the symptoms unquestionably produced by strychnia tetanus, then the hypothesis of the Crown entirely fails, and John Parsons Cook cannot have died of strychnia poison.

Now, gentlemen, whether that be so or not will depend in a great degree, as it strikes me—but of course it is entirely for you—on what you think of the evidence of Elizabeth Mills; but before I go to the evidence of Elizabeth Mills I will call your attention to what the description of strychnia tetanus is, as given us by two very eminent gentlemen who were called the other day for the Crown, Dr. Taylor and Dr. Christison; and if we find on looking at it that that description of the poison of strychnia tetanus, given by them, is a different thing from the picture first given of the complaint, of the paroxysms of John Parsons Cook by Elizabeth Mills and Mr. Jones, I think it would be rather too bad on their mere opinion to say that this is strychnia tetanus. Let us take Dr. Taylor's description of strychnia tetanus: I am not sure whether Dr. Taylor stated he had ever seen strychnia tetanus in the human

subject; however, we must be just to Dr. Taylor. Dr. Taylor has had an extensive reading upon the subjects upon which he writes, and it is not to be supposed that Dr. Taylor would hastily set down in his book what he did not find established on high authority; therefore, though having it at secondhand, Dr. Taylor knows something upon the subject.

Now Dr. Taylor, in his work on strychnia poison, has this under the head of strychnia, "that from five to twenty minutes after the poison has been swallowed the patient is suddenly seized with tetanic symptoms, affecting the whole of the muscular system; the body becomes rigid, the limbs stretched out, and the jaws so fixed that considerable difficulty is experienced in introducing anything into the mouth." On both the depositions and the other evidence it is stated that Mr. Cook was sitting up in bed beating the bed-clothes, frequently telling the people about him to go for Palmer, asking for the remedy, and willing to take whatever was given him; there was no considerable difficulty in introducing anything into the mouth, and the paroxysms, instead of beginning within from five to twenty minutes after the poison was supposed to have been swallowed, did not begin for an hour and a half afterwards. Dr. Taylor further on states, "after several such attacks, increasing in severity, the patient dies asphyxiated." That there were some of these symptoms in this case there can be no doubt, and there will be some of them in every case of violent convulsions, yet it is not of the description of such a case as that of John Parsons Cook. Now, let us see what Dr. Christison

says: "The symptoms produced by strychnia are very uncommon and striking: the animal begins to tremble, and is seized with stiffness and starting of the limbs. Those symptoms increase till at length the animal is attacked by general spasms." Is that the description of either of these paroxysms? Who can say with any degree of truth that it is? Just observe these last indications of strychnia tetanus, which are consistent with all the cases stated in their books. It is only justice to those gentlemen who have taken pains to look to the authorities to which they refer, to say that the statements which they give of their cases are in the main correct, but not in all their details. The books would be five times their size if they were; but they are in the main correct, when we look to the foreign authorities on which they are founded:—"The fit is then succeeded by an interval of calm, during which the senses are impaired or are unnaturally acute; but another paroxysm soon sets in, and then another and another, until at last a fit occurs more violent than any that had preceded it, and the animal perishes suffocated." I know exactly what Dr. Christison means by this, because there is a gentleman here who will state an experiment which I saw myself; it was an experiment, and for the purpose of this case, and to assist me; and I disagree with Dr. Taylor that there can be a moment's hesitation in sacrificing ten or twenty dogs for the purpose of ascertaining the truth of this theory when a man's life is involved. These experiments were performed by Dr. Letheby while I was there. I will state them to you, because he will prove it by-

and-by. A dog had some strychnia put in his mouth, one grain, and then for about—I cannot be sure as to the time exactly, but about twenty or twenty-five minutes—I cannot be sure, it might not be so much—the dog was perfectly well. There were two rabbits on the table which were about also to be subjected to the operation, and the dog, when the chain was sufficiently relaxed to enable him to do so, showed all the indications which a dog naturally does to get at the rabbits; he was pulling at his chain, and was smelling and pawing and taking an interest in the rabbits; suddenly it fell down on its side, and its legs were stretched out in a most violent way. It panted, and then it remained for some time—two or three minutes—quiet, occasionally a little jerking, but generally quiet. It recovered again for a time, got up and looked at the rabbits, but was dizzy, seemed afraid to move; and, if you touched it, shuddered and twitched, to use Miss Elizabeth Mills' description; seemed to be afraid, and after another moment down it went again. It got up again, and down it went again, and at last it had a tremendous struggle, and it died. That is what Dr. Christison means by this description; it would be true if the dose had been a strong one. If the dose had not been sufficient to kill the dog, it would probably be a longer time—at least, I suppose so—in producing its effect, and the interval between the paroxysms, as stated by Dr. Taylor and Dr. Christison, would get less and less, until at last the animal would recover. If the dose is strong enough to kill, the interval between the paroxysms is shorter, till at last the violent one

comes which destroys life; the eyes are fixed, and there it lies, and just before its death—and I thought it was dead, but I was told immediately before its death—just before it dies, the limbs become as supple and as free as it is possible to conceive the limbs of an animal to be; whichever way you placed them after the animal is quite dead, if you place them in any form, the *rigor mortis* comes on, and they remain in the position in which you place them. Dr. Christison says they assume rigidity. I saw this operation performed, and also on the two rabbits, and their symptoms were substantially the same, and their limbs in both cases were quite as flaccid immediately on death. The animals during the time of the intervals between the paroxysms were exceedingly touchy, and seemed afraid of being touched at all; if you were to touch them, they would shrink away. It was more so in the dog; it was in fact a sort of shudder—that is what Dr. Christison means.

Now, gentlemen, without going through the whole of these details, I will state to you my reasons for saying, on the authorities and from my study of the books of those two gentlemen, that according to their principles this cannot have been strychnia poison. Now, I object to the theory of its being strychnia poison, first, on this ground, that no case can be found in the books, in which the patient while the paroxysm lasted has had so much command over the muscles of animal life and voluntary motion as Mr. Cook had on the Monday and Tuesday nights. You heard that Mr. Cook was sitting up in his bed, that Mr. Cook was beating the bed-clothes, that Mr.

Cook was talking and crying out for Palmer, and to have the remedy given to him; that Mr. Cook, so far from being afraid of people touching him, asked to have his neck rubbed, and it was rubbed. There is not a single instance in the books of Dr. Taylor, or in the books of Dr. Christison, or any other books of any medical man describing the symptoms of the strychnia poison, in which the well-known symptoms the *mallensio* took place—not one, and it is inconsistent with their description, and what I tell you will be the proof Dr. Letheby will give of the experiment that I saw, and of many others he has performed. The animal has not the power to do it, it is fixed in that way, there is nothing like it in any of their own books; wherefore, I submit to you on that part of the case—I will not weary you by reading their books, because they very frankly stated when I asked them—I do not know that I should use a hard term, because they think proper to believe in their theory and are desirous of promoting it; but I cannot but think—and I shall not be understood as saying that they would state deliberately what they believed to be untrue—but I cannot help thinking, as I said before, that they are fagging this theory to death.

I will go to the next point on the ground of which I say this is not strychnia poison. I say there is no authentic case of tetanus by strychnia in which the paroxysms were delayed so long after ingestion of the poison as in this case; no authority and no authentic report, by which I mean no case recorded in any work of authority, even an authority less than the

authority of these two honourable and respectable gentlemen, can be found in which the paroxysms have been delayed so long a time after the ingestion of the poison as in this case. I will refer, however, to their own statements, knowing that they are here.—[The learned Serjeant read an extract from Dr. Taylor's book.]—There was one case to which his attention was called, it was not a fatal one, but it got better, and still he says the symptoms were those which he described, and thought it was too late to get the poison out of the stomach, as in half an hour it had got into the circulation: what can be more clear? it is a broad distinguishing feature in the strychnia. The interval which took place between the ingestion of the poison in Mr. Cook's case, and the time when the paroxysm commenced, was much too long, three times too long, to indicate the effect of poison by strychnia. It cannot be pretended it was a similar case, if the symptoms are properly described, as I will presently call your attention to them, by Elizabeth Mills in her statement in this court. Now, gentlemen, thirdly I submit, and I will prove, that there is no case in which recovery from a paroxysm of strychnia poison has been so rapid as in Cook's case, on Monday night, or in which a patient has enjoyed so long an interval of repose or exemption from its symptoms after they had once set in. It is a very remarkable feature, if it be true—if I am right in saying that there is no case in which recovery has been so rapid as in Mr. Cook's case on Monday night, followed by so long an interval of relief from the paroxysm. In fact, in this case of Mr. Cook's, on the

theory of the Crown, it would not have come on again if a second dose had not been given. There was an end of it when Elizabeth Mills left Palmer sleeping by the side of his friend in the arm-chair. How easy it would have been for him then, if he had been disposed, when Elizabeth Mills had gone to bed and had retired to her room, to have called out to her that Mr. Cook was in another fit, and to have killed him, almost without suspicion on the part of anybody. Now let us see what Dr. Taylor says.—[The learned Serjeant read a passage from Dr. Taylor's book which has before been referred to.] That is what Dr. Christison tells us in general terms, that these convulsions are succeeded by intervals of calm, during which the senses are unnaturally and unusually acute; another fit then begins, it subsides, and is succeeded by another and another, till at length a fit takes place more violent than any before it, and the animal dies suffocated. Here, I submit to you, is a distinction between the case of Mr. Cook and that which these gentlemen state to be the distinguishing feature—in that there is no recurrence.—[The learned Serjeant read a passage from Dr. Christison's book.] Is that the case of Mr. Cook? Is it invariable? How can they, not finding the poison at all, and the features differing altogether from the description in their own books, be willing to give evidence tending to conclusions that Mr. Cook died by strychnia poison administered by the prisoner at the bar? Now I will come to another feature of the disease, the *post-mortem* symptoms of the disease. I am told, and it certainly was so in the case of the animals I

saw killed, that the result of an enormous proportion of the examinations has been, and, if properly conducted, of all of them, that the heart is full on the right side invariably. I am told if they do the thing clumsily they may get an empty heart—that is, if they open the head first and cut through some of the large arteries of the head or the throat, the head, in the act of the operation lying back, the blood from the heart will escape, and by its mere gravitation, will rush towards the vessels of the head. We will, however, prove to you that the heart of the animal which was killed by strychnia poison is invariably full, and it stands to reason it would be so; if you kill an animal, and I hope, if you have a doubt about it, that some morning before the Court sits you will desire that a reasonable number of animals shall be brought into one of the yards of this building, and that you see them die by strychnia, and form an opinion for yourselves.

Lord Campbell.—That cannot be.

[The learned Serjeant then proceeded to comment at great length upon the evidence of Elizabeth Mills, pointing to various discrepancies between her deposition before the coroner and her evidence in court; alleging that, although certainly not tampered with by the Crown, the various examinations to which she had been subjected had had the effect of instructing her what evidence to give; dwelling also with force on the omission from her evidence before the coroner, that she had been so violently sick after tasting the broth. If Elizabeth Mills had before the coroner described the symptoms of Cook's

convulsions as she had done in court, and had accompanied them with the same contortions of hands, neck and mouth, it could not have failed to attract the attention of Dr. Taylor, and must have led to an examination which would have appeared on the verbal depositions. But the symptoms described and gesticulated by her were inconsistent with any known disease, and were grouped by her in a manner so extraordinary as to be inconsistent with strychnia tetanus. It was not so clear that Palmer had come over from his house dressed as though he had not been to bed. The witnesses quite disagreed as to how he was dressed.] On this part of the case (the nature of the convulsions attending Cook's illness), continued the learned gentleman, I have this observation to make; the illness of the Sunday night appears to have been a very remarkable occurrence. It came out in the course of the examination, as a fact spoken to by himself, and it will be for you to judge, after you have heard the evidence of the medical gentlemen, whether the periodicity of the attacks does not militate against the theory of death by strychnia poison. The illness of Cook takes place three nights running, exactly at the same time, or if not exactly at the same time, very nearly. I find that is a symptom of very frequent occurrence, that about the same hour of the night, or of the week, or of the month, and very often after the patient has got to bed, the thing occurs. It is about the same hour in this case of Mr. Cook's. On this part of the case, the question whether the symptoms were such as are consistent with

the theory of strychnia poison, and inconsistent with the theory of death from other and natural causes, I have only now further to state what I intend to prove. I will not go through in detail what will be better stated by the gentlemen who will be called; but I shall call a number of most respectable physicians, surgeons, and general practitioners, having extensive experience in our large cities, who all support the view I have to submit to you, and which they have suggested to me as the probable one—that these fits of Mr. Cook were not tetanus, but violent convulsions, the result of the weak habit of his body, which had been increased by his mode of life, by at least a sufficient amount of disease to render violent mineral poisons in his opinion, and in the opinion of those he consulted, necessary medicines, which would lead to ulceration of the tonsils, difficulty in swallowing, and a state of things which, according to Dr. Savage, would have continued for a considerable time, if he had not had influence enough to stay it, by inducing Cook to abandon the course of physic which he had been taking. Through the whole course of that time his constitution would be affected. I will show you that such fits have frequently occurred under strong mental excitement, brought on by various causes, such as excess in eating and drinking, attacks of gout or dyspepsia, retching and vomiting, violent mental emotions of any kind, the patient being thrown into convulsions of the voluntary muscles, exhibiting tetanic or tetaniform contortions, in the midst of which he dies asphyxiated or exhausted, his body after death exhibiting no traces whatever of

the disease. In addition to that, I will call many gentlemen before you who will speak to their experiments on animals, and who will be ready, if my Lord thinks it right, to show you the experiments that you may judge for yourselves. They will speak also to the mode of detecting in bodies the most putrescent the presence of strychnia. Agreeing with Orfila, the highest authority on this branch of science, they say they can find it, and be sure of it—if it has been administered, and been the cause of death—in the dead body for months after life became extinct.

Having now done with this part of the case, I will proceed to the last matter to which I propose to call your attention. I propose now to discuss the question whether the circumstantial evidence against Palmer be such as to be inexplicable on the supposition of his innocence; and if I show you on the broad and salient features of the evidence that it is not (you will not expect me to go into the more minute details), and I have succeeded in satisfying you on any considerable portion of the points to which I have directed your attention, and if the evidence comes up to what I have been instructed to say it will, you will be too happy, recollecting that you are “the country” in the language of the law, to acquit him of this great crime. Every word of this evidence will be carried to all the ends and corners of the earth, and it will remain to be seen whether this great country of England, in a paroxysm or convulsion of prejudice, created by the rashness of one scientific man who had no knowledge of his own about the matter, has made up its mind to sacrifice the life of a fellow-creature

under circumstances which would expose any person who has ever been present at deathbed convulsions liable to the same charge. I say the circumstantial evidence in this case is not such as to justify you in coming to a conclusion of the guilt of the prisoner. I will endeavour in this part of the discussion to address myself to those portions of the case which seem at the first blush of them, and on judicial consideration of them, to require notice. I will not avoid anything that is difficult or that may seem to you difficult, so that when I sit down you will see that I have discussed this great argument fully and fairly in every branch of it, and ask yourselves what ground is there for any verdict but a verdict of “Not Guilty”? I will avoid nothing, and proceed at once to one of the most salient points. I will pass over, after an intimation that was made from the Bench, the point about pushing the man at the inquest, or the accident of a slit in the covering of the jar, which, sharp instruments being used by the operators, may easily have occurred, or the putting it in a further corner of the room, from which there was no possibility of its being removed. I do not believe that any such circumstances as these would induce you to come to a conclusion against the prisoner.

Lord Campbell.—No member of the Court, I think, has intimated any opinion as to the other portions of the case; merely as to the pushing.

Mr. Serjeant Shee.—I do not wish to suggest anything which is not strictly correct, and perhaps I ought not to use what was intimated from the Bench in any way, but rather submit, where everybody

perfectly well knew Palmer, any little apparent shove, so to speak, during the course of the *post-mortem* is not to be taken as an evidence of guilt. It was in leaning over, if at all, to observe an examination of considerable interest to all persons present, and I cannot conceive that anything of this kind can be taken into consideration. No serious complaint was made at the time. Mr. Devonshire said nothing was lost by it. He said also, the jar was removed to a corner of the room. It was not removed out of sight. It was in the broad daylight. It was impossible it could be taken away without observation. It would be absurd that Palmer should be suspected of having done so with an improper object. This we know, that he was very reluctant to have the jar removed out of the possession of those on whom he could rely—that is very true. There were some persons who did not want to pay him 13,000*l*. There were some persons who had been doing all they could to undermine his character for a very considerable time, imputing to him the most wicked conduct respecting a near relation, which none of his own relations ever joined in, knowing that there were many persons at Rugeley much prejudiced against him, and it was, in his judgment, of the last importance that anything which could be brought against him (and it was clear that this *post-mortem*, from the conduct of Stephens, was intended to found a charge against him) should be kept in unsuspected custody, and that nobody should have an opportunity of tampering with it and its contents. When told that Dr. Harland is coming to make the *post-mortem*, he says, “I am glad of that, for there is no

knowing who might have done it; and it is a satisfaction that you, whom I do know, are coming to superintend it.” I say that was the conduct of a respectable man, who knows that his conduct would bear investigation if it were properly conducted. Is there any other part of his conduct connected with the *post-mortem* which requires explanation? When the jar was going to be sent to town, he objects to its going to Frere’s. He had some reason for that. He had an assistant in his service who had been in the service of Frere. We know the jealousies that exist in country towns between professional men. We will not do Mr. Frere the injustice to suppose he would do so great a wrong to Palmer as might result from tampering with the contents of the jar; but still it was right to be cautious, and Palmer told Dr. Harland, “I want you to take it with you to Stafford, and not let it go to Frere’s house.” In these minor incidental matters, his conduct appears to me perfectly consistent with innocence. Let me call your attention to this more important matter, on which my learned friend in his instructions was told to rely: and accordingly he did, in the discharge of his duty, rely upon it. I will call your attention to what has been stated by Myatt, the postboy. His evidence was pressed into the case; it could not well be excluded from it as an evidence of guilt. Now, what did it amount to? Before I have done, under the general head of Palmer’s conduct, I will call your attention to what passed between him and Stephens. You will find the conduct and deportment of the latter were such as would make some men almost kick him; it was so very provoking,

supposing Palmer was innocent. He dissembled with him—pretended to take his advice—cross-questioned him—changed his tone upon him—now speaking to him mildly, now in a voice of menace—threatened him with a *post-mortem* examination—and evidently did the whole thing hostilely to him, as if he thought something wrong had taken place, and it was his duty not only to protect the property, but to see any person who had been guilty of foul play towards Cook brought to condign punishment. Stephens, after poring over the remains of the dead man at the *post-mortem* examination, was ready to leave Rugeley, and a fly was ordered for him and his companion Mr. Boycott, in which they were to proceed with the jar to Stafford, and thence by rail to London. Now, if there were anybody base enough, either in support of a theory, in support of a reputation—God forbid that I should suggest that to the prejudice of Dr. Taylor—if there were anybody capable of so great a wickedness as tampering with the jar, it might easily be done; and he was anxious to have it kept by Dr. Harland, and not committed to the custody of Stephens. His conduct to Palmer had been vexatious and annoying in the last degree; the fly was being got ready after Palmer, we may suppose, had dined; and meeting the postboy Myatt, he asked him, according to Myatt, whether he was going to drive Mr. Stephens to Stafford. “I told him,” said Myatt, “I was. He asked me if I would upset them?” Now the word “them” was first used in this court to designate the jars. There was only one jar at that time, so it could not be meant to apply to

the jars, if used at all, which I think very doubtful for the reason I tell you—at least in a bad sense—it must have been applied to Mr. Stephens and his companion. And now just see if the facts in this case, which are undoubted, do not give a reasonable colour to that. Palmer (though I will show you his conduct to Stephens was exemplary in every respect, by putting the dialogue between them before you without making any comment on it) must have felt outraged beyond all expression if—knowing himself to be innocent, that he had acted as a friend and brother to Cook, and had called his relations about him when he was ill—he found himself suspected of stealing a trumpery betting-book, which he knew was of no use to any one, and charged of playing falsely and foully with the life of Cook. He had great cause to be vexed and irritated with Stephens, and that he was so is plain from what he said to Dr. Harland: “There was a queer old fellow,” he said, who has been down making inquiries, who seemed to be suspicious of my having stolen the betting-book, which everybody knows can be of no earthly use to anybody.” It shows that his mind was impressed with the idea that he was wronged. He may be supposed, communing with himself, to say, “He has ill-treated me; he has encouraged suspicions which have been excited against me already, and which, if he persists in his course of bringing another charge against me in this matter, will probably render it impossible to get the money from the insurance company in time to rescue me from a position which may involve in ruin myself and some members of my family.” That was evidently the tendency of

what Stephens was about. He meets this postboy and asks him if he is to be ready to drive the fly to Stafford; the boy says, "Yes, I am." He said, "if I would upset them, there was a 10*l.* note for me." He has been asked, "Had anything been said about the jars?" I submit to you the true construction of the story, if it occurred at all, is, that, being under a feeling of irritation against Stephens, and using strong expressions with regard to Stephens, hearing he was going to Stafford, he said, "I should not mind giving 10*l.* to upset him." He had been vexed at his conduct, and irritated by the perpetual suspicions and inquisitiveness which he had displayed, even when he went up with him like a friend to show him the corpse, uncovering it down to the thighs. Some previous suspicion must have existed in Stephens's mind; but Palmer had no suspicion of this thought that he was guilty of so foul a crime as that which was imputed to him. If that evidence be throughout true, it is only true in the milder and innocent sense, and I have this reason for saying so. 'This man was in the service of the landlord of the Talbot Arms, and was always about the yard; he was driving to and from the Talbot Arms every day of his life; he must have been there on the day of the *post-mortem* examination; he must have been a constant companion of the stable-boys and labourers about the yard; and his observation must have been drawn to a thing so striking and remarkable as a *post-mortem* examination on account of a suspicion of murder. He was not called before the coroner; and nobody knew, at the time the inquest was held, that he had ever said any-

thing which could be fairly taken in a sense which would make it evidence of a guilty mind in Palmer. But if he had said that Palmer said, "I should not mind giving a 10*l.* note to have him upset; it is a humbugging concern," and in that manner, and with the feeling I have stated, it would not have excited any observation or suspicion, and no one would have summoned Myatt to the inquest. I submit that is the true version of this story. It is not to be supposed that a medical man, knowing that he had given a large dose of strychnia, would suppose that, by the accidental spilling of a jar, the liver and spleen, and some of the tissues continuing untouched, he could have escaped the detection of his guilt.

[The learned Serjeant then commented on the evidence of Charles Newton, and said that his suppression of the statement respecting the first sale of strychnia until the day before the trial, made his evidence quite unworthy of belief. He called on the jury utterly to discard it. Besides, Palmer had just been to London, where he could have bought the drug without the possibility of suspicion. Why should he purchase it at Rugeley, where suspicion was sure to arise?]

I am now in a condition to satisfy you that Palmer was undoubtedly not in the town, and that he could not have been there at 9 o'clock; that he was in London at a quarter-past 3 o'clock, and that he could not have been there by 9 o'clock, the hours at which the trains start rendered it impossible. The thing is false, downright false. It is impossible to have got to Rugeley before a quarter past 10, and we will account for what he did in a way that will entirely

satisfy you. He attended the *post-mortem* examination, and is it credible that a skilful medical man, who had studied at the London hospitals, would have gone to that dolt Newton to ask him as to what would be the effects of strychnia on a dog's stomach? Is it credible that he should go to that stupid sort of fellow, who gave his evidence in that dogged, mulish, sullen manner, which often is indicative of something else besides the want of understanding, and that he would have gone and asked a chap like that, "What are the effects of strychnia?" and then, when he had been told, he would snap his fingers and say, "All right." It cannot be; it is impossible. No one would believe it; and I submit to you confidently that unless there is much stronger evidence than that, it is evidence on which you cannot rely for a moment. To show the animus of this Newton against Palmer, I will remind you of what he stated. Palmer said "that you will find that he has taken a great deal of mercury; you will find this 'fellow' died from a diseased throat." When he is questioned about it mildly and quietly by my friend Mr. Grove, as to what was the exact term used, he answers, "I do not know whether he said poor or rich;" just as if it could be a question of that kind. What he wanted to know was, whether he had spoken of the poor dead man in a pitying way, or whether he had spoken of him as a disreputable person, unworthy of all consideration. As to that part of the case I will say no more, and I will proceed to other matters, taking you back again to what occurred at Shrewsbury.

The case for the Crown is, that as early as the 14th of November,
VOL. XCVIII.

at Shrewsbury, the scheme, the plot, of poisoning commenced. That is the supposition of those from whom the case has been taken by the Crown. Now, it is suggested that on the night of Wednesday, the 14th, Palmer dosed this man, Cook, with something that he put into his brandy, and the witness Fisher told us that Cook told him so. If you remember the early part of my address to you, I read a few words at the end of a letter from Cook to Fisher, in which, after telling him it was of vast importance to him, as well as to Palmer, that 500*l.* should be paid to Mr. Pratt, he adds in post-script, "I am better." These words must have referred to his illness at Shrewsbury. The letter relates to another matter, which is of great importance to him and to Palmer, and he does not seem to treat it as one, having in his own mind a belief that Palmer had drugged him with poison for the purpose of destroying his health at Shrewsbury. Then again, on the evidence, what does Palmer say himself about what occurred at Shrewsbury? He says, when it is mentioned, "Cook says I have put something in his glass; I do not play such tricks with people:" taking it as if it had been never understood otherwise than as a loose expression of a man, perhaps not actually drunk, the evidence does not go to that extent, though I think you will be of opinion he was very nearly approaching to that condition. Palmer did not get to Shrewsbury on the Wednesday till after the dinner-hour at the Raven, and I do not think we have any distinct evidence how Cook passed that day at the Raven. But I shall be in a condition to prove that he went to the Unicorn, where Saunders was;

that he came there pretty flush; that they heard of the vomiting and the sickness which Mrs. Brooks told us about. He was at the Unicorn with a lady and Saunders. Who the lady was I do not know, nor does it matter. There he drank for the benefit of mine host of the Unicorn as execrable brandy as it would be possible to get. Seven or eight glasses of brandy-and-water did that young man "knock down" during the evening. The result was, no doubt, that his inflamed syphilitic throat was in a dreadful state of actual ulceration and soreness. Next morning Cook looked very ill, as men are apt to do after excessive vinous vomiting: but his drunken suspicions of Palmer had evaporated with the fumes of the brandy, and they were again friends and brother sportsmen. He breakfasted with Palmer the next morning; he was good friends with him the whole of the day, and went with him to Rugeley, and there remained on Palmer's invitation. In consequence of the letter which Pratt wrote on the 13th, and which Palmer got on the 14th, in which they both had an interest, Cook wrote to Pratt to say that somebody would call on him with 200*l.*, and he wrote to Fisher to tell Fisher to do so. Did anybody at that time believe that there was any intention to drug and poison this man? Does not the explanation that Mrs. Brookes gave seem the correct one? She tells you, "That night I heard in several directions of a great number of people who were purged and vomited; there was a general affection of the kind amongst strangers visiting Shrewsbury on that occasion."—About the tumbler

which she saw in Palmer's hand I cannot suggest any reason because it is not in my instructions, but it might probably be accounted for in this way: When he came back from Rugeley and found all the people indisposed, he would naturally look at the water to see if there was anything to account for its unwholesomeness. Mrs. Brookes said, and that is the point to which I wish to call your attention, that he was in a passage under a chandelier; that the waiter pointed to him when he showed her up-stairs; that he spoke to her while holding up the glass to the light, and said, "Wait a minute, and I will come to you." Nothing can be more natural than that; and I submit to you it is impossible to say that there is anything to justify a suspicion of poison in it. With regard to the money he gave to Fisher, I can suggest no other reason than that, just before being sick, he gave his money to Fisher, feeling that it was coming upon him, and that his stomach was revolting at the liberties he had taken with it. He had the good sense to place his money, when he was still very sick, in the hands of Fisher, and he afterwards went to bed. It may have been that he had been guilty of excess in eating and drinking, and it was necessary to send for the doctor, who, when he came, wished to send him an emetic. The young man knew so well what to do that he said, "Oh! I can make myself sick without an emetic; I will put my tooth-brush down my throat; I can be sick without your emetic." He took a pill when it was recommended to him and a black draught, and the moment he laid his head on his pillow he was perfectly free from any alarm,

and he got up the next morning perfectly well. Gentlemen, that is really too ludicrous to be worthy of a moment's consideration. Now let us go to certain other matters, and more particularly to the conduct of the prisoner himself. I would just mention that there was a person there of the name of Myatt in the room at the time they say the brandy-and-water was drugged. Why was he not called? The others came in just before going to bed, but Myatt had been there the whole evening, and was not a mere accidental visitor in the room. You will hear his version so far as it is necessary. They have now got back to Rugeley, and then the history of the slow poisoning continues. Cook and Palmer go back together, and probably they talk all the way about Pratt and their difficulties, and the way of getting out of them, and of the small way that the winnings of Shrewsbury will go to effect the object. They both see ruin staring them in the face unless the Prince of Wales Office can be forced to pay the money due upon the policy of insurance, and they can remain free from all suspicion of insolvency or misconduct in the mean time. When they get to Rugeley, by sending up the 200*l.* to Pratt, they provide for the temporary difficulty. They are on friendly terms, Palmer making use of Cook's things, and probably both retaining their own objects, as it would appear that Palmer said directly Cook died that he had some interest in bills which were outstanding; and that might well have been, considering they were engaged in racing transactions; that they were joint owners of one horse; that they had the same trainer, betted for each

other at races, and that they were confederates and friends on the turf, in that sort of relation to each other which gave them a joint interest in the same ventures. Cook sat at the table of Palmer on the 16th, and wrote up that night to Pratt. Cook goes to bed late on that evening, well enough, not so drunk as to prevent his asking the chambermaid to give him a longer candle, in order that he might read in bed. He seems to have had a little champagne, not so much as to have made him drunk, yet perhaps too much for a stomach weakened by the excess, if it was excess, at Shrewsbury, or by the vomiting which was occasioned by the illness there, and the hot water which he had taken. He gets up the next morning poorly; he eats nothing that day; ails enough for Mr. Bamford to be called in by Palmer, and Palmer is unremitting in his attention to him on that day and the Sunday following.

Now it is said that that very attentiveness is evidence of the prisoner's guilt. What, as my friend here (Mr. Grove) says, what is a man to do? Here is a young fellow's health in very considerable danger. Cook, having a joint interest in racing transactions with Palmer, thinks it convenient to stop at Rugeley, where he has no friend but Palmer. They are not flush of money, and Palmer has a house and an establishment on a moderate scale immediately opposite the inn in which Cook is staying. He is enabled to send such things over as can be got in a private house, not at hotel prices, but at a very trifling expense. Living exactly opposite to the house of Palmer, Cook would have stayed in Palmer's house all day,

no doubt, if he had been well enough. He was on a visit to Palmer, and he knew nobody there but Palmer. He was ailing; and as it is very dull for a man who has no intellectual pursuits to be alone all day when out of health, Palmer goes over and talks to him, and attends to him, and gets him what comforts he can. That is what a man would do to a friend; it is precisely what a man would do. If he had not done it, but merely attended to him at night when he was taken ill on the Monday night, without visiting him during the day, it might have been said that he was neglecting him, and only attended to him when he wanted to give him another dose of poison. That is the way the Crown would have put it then! He is laboriously attentive to him under circumstances which can well be accounted for by the reason that he had actually, if not a sincere friendship for him, at least a friendly kind of liking for him, and an interest with him on betting and racing transactions, and could supply him with several things from his house at little or no expense. If Cook had been well he would probably have had his meals at Palmer's house. He was ill, and Palmer sends Dr. Bamford to him. He saw him at 8 o'clock on Sunday morning and again at 6 or 7 o'clock. Cook told him his bowels had been moved twice or thrice. That is what he told Dr. Bamford; it may have been known to Palmer that it was oftener, and that the truth was he was slightly suffering under some symptoms of diarrhœa, as he afterwards stated in the letter to Jones. It was Cook himself who told Dr. Bamford about his bowels having been

moved; and on the same day Palmer wrote a letter to Jones, intending to bring Jones there, he being about to go to London, and stated "Cook had been suffering from diarrhœa." It was at Shrewsbury, where everybody else had diarrhœa: he took the pill and black draught, and their effects continued, probably, to some extent when he was at Rugeley. It is absurd to pretend that the suggestion of diarrhœa could have any sinister object, as Jones must have ascertained the truth as soon as he arrived at Rugeley.

I now beg to call your attention to the next important fact in this case. It seems to me to be, though I touch upon it briefly here, one of the very last importance, and one which ought to decide it in the prisoner's favour. The supposition of the Crown is, that Palmer intended to dose Cook with antimony to keep his stomach in a perpetual state of vomiting, in order the more easily to despatch him by strychnia; that he began the plot on the Wednesday at Shrewsbury and continued it at Rugeley, and that during the Sunday Cook was under the influence of that treatment: Sunday was the day Palmer attempted, as was said, to force the broth upon him. Now, being bent, as it is supposed, upon destroying Cook, there is one man in the world who would be the very last witness he would select as a witness of his proceedings. He was a medical man, in the prime of life, intimately acquainted with Cook, living in the same house with him, much attached to him, at all events sufficiently attached to him to come to him as soon as he had heard that he had had an attack of diarrhœa—Mr. Jones of Lut-

terworth. Palmer, intending to go to London, and not wishing to leave Cook alone, wrote on the Sunday to Mr. Jones, telling him that Cook was then ill with the diarrhœa, a statement which is not altogether inconsistent with the evidence of Dr. Bamford and what Cook stated, and begs of him to come over. I beg of you to pause here for a moment in order to appreciate the full importance of this fact; the more you think of it, the more profound will be your conviction that it affords evidence irrefragable of Palmer's innocence. The imputation upon Palmer is, that he intended to kill Cook to possess himself of his winnings. Who was with Cook when the race was won? Who was by his side on Shrewsbury race-course for the three minutes that he was speechless? Who saw him take out his betting-book and count his winnings? Who but Jones—Jones, who was his bosom friend, his companion, his confidant, and who knew to the last farthing the amount of his gains? Jones was, of all men living, the most likely to be the recipient of Cook's confidence, and the man bound by every consideration of honour, friendship, and affection to protect him, to vindicate his cause, and to avenge his death. Yet this was the man for whom Palmer sent, that he might converse with Cook, receive his confidence, minister to him in his illness, and even sleep in the same room with him! How, if Palmer is the murderer they represent him, are you to account for his summoning Jones to the bed-side of the sick man? If Cook really suspected—as we are assured he did—that Palmer was poisoning him, Jones was the man to whom he would most willingly

have unbosomed himself, and in whose faithful ear he would have most eagerly disburthened the perilous stuff that weighed upon his own brain. Jones, as well as Palmer, was a medical man, and it is not improbable that, in the course of his studies, the former may have noted in his class-book the very passages respecting the operation of strychnia which had attracted the attention of the latter. Is it conceivable that, if Palmer meant to slay Cook with poison in the dead of the night, he would have previously insured the presence in his victim's chamber of a medical witness, who would know from his frightful symptoms that the man was not dying a natural death? He brings a medical man into the room, and makes him lie within a few inches of the sick man's bed, that he may be startled by his terrific shrieks, and gaze upon those agonizing convulsions which indicate the fatal potency of poison! Can you believe it? He might have despatched him by means that would have defied detection, for Cook was taking morphia medicinally, and a grain or two more would have silently thrown him into an eternal sleep; but instead of doing so, he sends to Lutterworth for Jones. You have been told that this was done to cover appearances. Done to cover appearances! No, no, no! You cannot believe it—it is not in human nature—it cannot be true—you cannot find him guilty—you dare not find him guilty on the supposition of its truth—the country will not stand by you if you believe it to be true—you will be impeached before the whole world if you say that it is true—I believe in my conscience that it is false,

because, consistently with the laws that govern human nature, it cannot possibly be true.

Gentlemen, there are other facts to be adverted to before I sit down, to which it is necessary your attention should be drawn. There was a great stir at the hotel at Rugeley after Mr. Jones had returned from London with Mr. Stephens, the executor. Mr. Stephens arrives at the inn with Mr. Jones, has been in conversation all the way down with Mr. Jones, and has heard from Mr. Jones all that Mr. Jones knows, and does not appear to have had anything communicated to him by Mr. Jones which could justify any suspicion on his part. Mr. Jones, when they arrive at Rugeley, introduces him to Palmer, and Palmer at once takes him up to the room of the dead man, and uncovers the body down to the thighs, and Mr. Stephens looks at the corpse and sees there are no convulsions about the body except the clenching of the hands. He sees there is no emaciation, no signs as he thinks of illness, and, wondering within himself, he says, "how can you have died?" or something to that effect; "how grievous a thing it is that your young life should have passed away!" I think he said he did not look as if he were dead. After seeing the corpse they went down to dinner, and he asked Palmer to dine with him, and Mr. Jones, and Mr. Bradford, the husband of Mr. Cook's sister. He has not been called; he could have told us if there was anything suspicious in the conduct of Palmer, anything that could justify such conduct on the part of Mr. Stephens. They have their dinner, and when their dinner is over, see what takes place. It is important you should

know it, because I think you will see from the way it occurred that the conduct of Palmer was the conduct of a man certainly apprehensive of any sort of vexatious inquiry which might involve him in pecuniary troubles, and was therefore anxious to conciliate Mr. Stephens, still comporting himself like one who could firmly and freely maintain his equality with Mr. Stephens, unabashed, with a clear brow and the appearance of an innocent man.—[The learned Serjeant read a portion of the dialogue which took place between Mr. Stephens and Palmer.] He said "with a spasmodic convulsion of the throat," which was perfectly apparent; he could not see his face, but there was a spasmodic convulsion of his throat. Who could believe such a testimony of guilt as that? He expects that Palmer is to be bound to look after everything of every kind that was in the hotel belonging to Cook, and because he could not find a trumpery book, which anybody might have taken away, thinking and probably having heard it was of very little use, which could not be of the slightest service in any way to Palmer for any purpose whatever, or to anybody, simply on that account he is to indulge in this vexatious proceeding. The last time the book was seen was on the Monday. The last person who saw it was Elizabeth Mills, on the Monday, and on that day there were several people there with Cook—Saunders the trainer, and the jockeys; after his death the two servant-maids and the housekeeper, the three undertaker's men, the two women who laid Cook out, and some other persons; the barber who shaved him might have taken the book,

and having taken it could not return it; for here again is the effect of dishonesty as well as falsehood. Once done, you cannot repair it; without admitting it you cannot set it right again. I throw imputation on nobody; I simply say, that as many people had access to the room, it is not fair, it is not right under the circumstances when a man is charged in such a case of momentous importance without any assignable reason for his purloining the betting-book, to fix it on him without any proof that he ever had it in his hands, when nothing like a proper search was made for it until some time after Cook's death. I asked whether the drawers were not full of linen and clothes, the answer was that they were. It was not seen immediately after the death, nor was there any search made for it, nor was it set aside and taken care of in the room, so that it could not have been removed by Palmer with a guilty intention of purloining it. Let us go on for a moment with this dialogue—[The learned Serjeant then read a passage from the dialogue as detailed in the evidence]—and at last, after goading and irritating the man for all this time, though Palmer was willing to make explanations and provoke inquiries into any thing or circumstance which if inquired into would at once have led to a discussion of matters in a fair and gentlemanlike manner, Stephens snubs him by asking him whether he intends to be at the *post-mortem*; and at last, when he says “it is a matter of indifference to me,” goads the poor man into saying, “so it is to me.” That is the only word of irritation that Palmer—who kept his ground during the whole time

and stood up to this man—that is the only word of irritation that he used. Mr. Stephens speaks to him in a very warm manner, yet Palmer manifests the composure of a gentleman, of a man of feeling and consideration to the father—as he called himself—but the stepfather of the young man, and that is to be turned into evidence of guilt.

There is another story made against him, that he was found searching in the pockets of Mr. Cook shortly after his death; it is the most absurd suggestion on their own showing. The facts were these. Mr. Jones, I think, told the servants to tell Palmer to come into the room. I think that was it—to tell Palmer to go into the room; and then I think Mr. Jones told another servant to follow him into the room. Elizabeth Mills is the witness to that. She says, “I went in and I saw him looking about seeing if there was anything in one of the coats, and he also looked under the bolster of the bed, just as a gentleman might be looking for a watch; and he went on doing so after I got into the room.” It was quite clear she suspected nothing, and I submit it is not fair that any suspicion should attach to him on the subject.

One other circumstance there is on which reliance has been placed; and although it has been said great reliance is not intended to be placed upon it, I cannot tell what effect it will produce on your minds. I am sure that when those who have promoted this prosecution first undertook it, they intended to rely, as proof of damning guilt, on the manuscript extracts about strychnia in these medical books. I think it will be

within your experience that in youth and early manhood the best protection that a man can have for his honour and integrity is the company and society of a wife whom he loves. If you find a man in early youth attached to a virtuous young woman, whom he loves with a sincere and heartfelt attachment, depend upon it he is of a gentle nature, and little prone to deeds of violence. They have put in these books to show that Palmer had a knowledge of strychnia poison, and they are the books which he used when a student attending lectures in London, as must have been known to his deceased wife. I find, in what I am in a condition to prove to be her own handwriting, proof positive that this was his student's book, and that he then and long after loved that young woman in the way in which it is God's will, under the sanction of His holy ordinance, young men should love their wives. His marriage was a marriage of affection; he loved her for herself and for her person; he loved her as ardently as he now loves her first-born, his only surviving child, a boy of seven years old, who waits with trembling anxiety for a sentence which will restore him to his father's arms, or drive that father to an ignominious death upon the scaffold. He loved her with a pure, generous affection. There is proof positive in this letter, copied in her handwriting into his note-book, that such a man was William Palmer when only a few years younger than he is now:—

“ My dearest Annie,—I snatch a moment to write to your dear, dear little self. I need scarcely say the principal inducement I have to work is the desire of get-

ting my studies finished, so as to be able to press your dear little form in my arms. With best, best love, believe me, dearest Annie, your own William.”

Now this is not the sort of letter that is generally read in courts of justice. It was no part of my instructions to read it to you, but that book was put in to prove that this man was a wicked, heartless, savage desperado, and I show you from it what he was when that letter was written—what his deceased wife knew him to be when she copied it—a young man who loved a young woman for her own sake—loved her with a pure and virtuous affection; such an affection as would in almost all natures be a sure antidote against guilt.

Such, gentlemen, is the man whom it is my duty to defend. Upon the evidence which is before you I cannot believe him guilty. Do not suppose for a moment that he is abandoned in this dreadful strait by his family and friends. An aged mother, who may have disapproved of some parts of his conduct, expects in an agony of grief your verdict. A dear sister can scarcely sustain herself under the suspense which presses upon her. A gallant and devoted brother stands by him to defend him, sparing neither time nor labour to save him from an awful doom. I call upon you to expand your minds to a capacity for estimating the high duty that you have to perform. You have to stem the torrent of prejudice; you have to vindicate the honour and character of your country; you have with firmness and courage to do your duty, and find a verdict for the Crown, if you believe that guilt is proved; but if you have a doubt upon the point, depend upon it

the time will come when the innocence of this man will be made apparent, and when you will deeply regret any want of due and calm consideration of the case which it will be my duty to lay before you.

The address of Serjeant Shee occupied the whole of the seventh day. On the following day he called his medical witnesses. Their statements and opinions were as minute and exhaustive as those of the witnesses called for the Crown. It is impossible to give any notion of the variety of opinions put in scientific language, put forward by these gentlemen, some of them persons of undoubted eminence. Among them were Mr. Nunneley, Professor of Surgery at the Leeds School of Medicine; Mr. Herepath, the celebrated analytical chemist, Professor of Chemistry and Toxicology at the Bristol Medical School; Mr. Rogers, Professor of Chemistry at the St. George's School of Medicine, London; Dr. Letheby, Professor of Medicine in the Medical College of the London Hospital; several surgeons who had witnessed cases of tetanus; Mr. Gay, Surgeon to Free Hospital; Mr. Pemberton, Lecturer on Anatomy at Queen's College, Birmingham, who had assisted at the second examination of Cook's body after exhumation. The opinions of these gentlemen went to negative the case of the Crown, that Cook's death arose from the administration of strychnia, and to refer it to natural causes. The nature of their statements may be best conceived by the statements of Serjeant Shee in his address, and by the analysis of the case for the defence in the reply of the Attorney-General.

The other witnesses called for

the defence offered nothing material; their evidence went chiefly to minute points, tending to prove discrepancies in the evidence of the Crown witnesses. Mr. Jeremiah Smith, so often referred to, not only made a most disgraceful exhibition, but materially damaged the case of the prisoner (if there was room for it) by the admissions extracted from him by the Attorney-General, inasmuch as he showed that Palmer's schemes of fraud on the insurance offices were far more extensive and systematic than had been supposed.

THE REPLY.

Mr. Attorney-General.—May it please your Lordships.—Gentlemen of the Jury,—The case for the prosecution and the case for the defence are now before you; and it becomes my duty to address to you such observations upon the whole of the materials, upon which your judgment is to be founded, as suggest themselves to my mind. I have a solemn and an important duty to perform. I wish that I could have answered the appeal made to me the other day by my learned friend, Mr. Serjeant Shee, and have felt that I was satisfied with the case that he submitted to you on the part of the defence. But, standing here as the instrument of public justice, I feel that I should be wanting in the duty that I have to perform if I did not ask at your hands for a verdict of guilty against the accused. I approach the consideration of the case in what, I hope, I may term a spirit of fairness, of moderation, and of truth. My business is to convince you, if I can, by facts and legitimate argument, of the prisoner's guilt. If I cannot establish it to your satisfaction, no man will

rejoice more than I shall in the verdict that you will pronounce of Not Guilty. Gentlemen, in the vast mass of materials which the evidence in this case has brought before you, two main questions present themselves prominently for your consideration—Did the deceased man, into whose death we are now inquiring, die a natural death; or was he taken off by the foul means of poison? And if the latter proposition be sanctioned by your approbation, then comes the important—if possible the still more important—question of whether the prisoner at the bar was the author of his death? I will proceed at once without further observation to the discussion of those questions, taking them in the order in which I have proposed them. Did John Parsons Cook die by poison? I assert and maintain the affirmative of that proposition. The case which is submitted to you on behalf of the Crown is this—That having been first practised upon by antimony, he was at last killed by strychnia; and the proposition which I have to establish is that the death of the deceased was occasioned by that poison; the first question, with a view of seeing what is the conclusion at which we shall arrive upon that point, is, what was the immediate and proximate cause of his death? The witnesses for the prosecution have told you one and all that he died, in their judgment, of tetanus, which signifies a spasmodic convulsive action of the muscles of the body. Can there be any doubt that that opinion is correct? Of course it does not follow that because he died from tetanus it must be tetanus from strychnia; that is a matter for after consideration. But, inasmuch as strychnia

produces death by tetanus, we must see in the first place whether it admits of any doubt that he did die of tetanus. I have listened with attention to every form in which that disease has been brought under your consideration, whether by the positive evidence of witnesses, or by reference to the works of scientific authors; and I assert deliberately that no case either of a human subject, or of any animal, has been brought under your notice in which the symptoms of tetanus have been so marked as they are in this case; from the moment the paroxysm came on, of which this unhappy man died, the symptoms were of the most marked and of the most striking character. Every muscle of his body, says the medical man who was present at the time, was convulsed; he expressed the most intense dread of suffocation; he entreated them to lift him up lest he should be suffocated, and when they stooped to raise him, every muscle of his body, from the crown of his head to the sole of his foot, was so stiffened, that the flexibility of the trunk and limbs was gone, so that they could have raised him as you would raise a dead corpse or a lifeless log. It was found to be impossible, and the man prayed to be turned over, in order to escape from the sense of the imminent risk of suffocation; they turned him over, and in the midst of doing so a fearful paroxysm, one mighty spasm, seems to have seized upon his heart, to have pressed from it the life-blood, so that in a moment vitality ebbed, and the man was dead before them; when dead, the body exhibited the most marked symptoms of this most fearful disease; it was bowed from head to foot, and it would have

rested, if it had been so placed, says the witness, upon the back of the head and the heels ; the hands were clenched with a grasp, which it required power to overcome, and the feet were curved till they assumed the appearance of a natural malformation. It is impossible to conceive symptoms more striking of tetanus ; nor is it possible to conceive evidence more dishonest than that which has attempted to represent it as any other than as a case of tetanus.

Well, then, if it was a case of tetanus, as to which I will not waste your time with any further observations, was it a case of tetanus from strychnia ? I will confine myself for the moment to the exhibition of the symptoms as they have been described by the witnesses. Tetanus may proceed from natural causes as well as from the administration of poison. While the symptoms last they are the same, but in the course of the symptoms, before the disease reaches its consummation in the death of the patient, the distinction between the two is marked by characteristics which will enable any one conversant with the subject to distinguish between them. We have been told upon the highest authority, that the distinctions are these :—Natural tetanus is a disease not of minutes, not even of hours, but of days. It takes, say several of the witnesses, from three to four days, and will extend to a period of even three weeks, before the patient is destroyed. Upon that point we have the most abundant and conclusive evidence. We have the evidence of gentlemen who have made it their especial study, like Mr. Curling and Dr. Todd. We have the evidence of one of the most eminent practitioners who

ever adorned that profession or any other ; I mean Sir Benjamin Brodie. We have the evidence of Mr. Gordon, who for twenty-eight years was surgeon to the Bristol Hospital ; we have the evidence of Dr. Daniel, who saw twenty-five or thirty of these cases of natural tetanus ; we have the evidence of a gentleman who practised for twenty-five years in India, where, owing to the particular character of the climate, those cases are infinitely more frequent than they present themselves here, and he gives exactly the same description of the course of symptoms through which this disease runs. Idiopathic or traumatic tetanus are, therefore, upon the evidence, out of the question ; but traumatic tetanus is out of the question for a very different reason. Traumatic tetanus is tetanus brought on by lesion of some part of the body. What is there in this particular case to show that there was lesion in any part of the body at all ? We have had the most singular representations upon the subject of Mr. Cook's health made by the witnesses who have come here on behalf of the defence, and who appear to have come into that box with the determination as far as possible to misconceive every fact which they could pervert to their purpose. We call before you, for the purpose of showing what Cook's health was, an eminent physician who had had him under his care. It seems that in the spring of 1855 Cook, having found certain small spots manifest themselves in one or two parts of his body, and having something of ulcers under his tongue, or in his throat, conceived that he was labouring under symptoms of a particular character, and he addressed himself to Dr. Savage, who found

the course of medicine he had been pursuing, founded upon this belief, was, in his judgment, an erroneous one; he altered it altogether; he enjoined the discontinuance of mercury, and was obeyed in his injunction; and the result was that the deceased, who was suffering, not from disease, but from the treatment, rapidly grew well. Nevertheless, lest there should be the possibility of mistake, Dr. Savage made him come to him from time to time, that he might see that things were going on right, and he sees, long before the summer had advanced, the very unsatisfactory symptoms had entirely gone, and that there was nothing about him except that affection of the throat to which sometimes people are subject, some abnormal condition of one of the tonsils, but in other respects the man was better than he had been, and might be said to be perfectly convalescent. On the very day he left London to go into the country, about a fortnight before the races, his step father accompanied him to the station, and congratulated him upon his healthy and vigorous appearance, and the young man, in the consciousness of the possession of health, struck his breast, and said he was well, and he felt so. Well, he goes to Shrewsbury, and shortly afterwards came those matters to which I shall have to call your attention presently more particularly that ended in his death. I want to know upon what part of this evidence there is the slightest pretence for saying that this man had any affection about him from which traumatic tetanus could ensue. It is said at some former time he had exhibited his throat to some of the witnesses, who were called, and that he had applied to Palmer for some mer-

curial wash to apply to his throat, or some of those ulcers. The precise period of it is not fixed, but it is perfectly clear that, though he had at one time adopted that course, under the recommendation of Dr. Savage he had got rid of it; and there is not the slightest pretence for saying that this man was suffering under a syphilitic affection of any kind; nevertheless, that fact was distinctly and unequivocally negatived by a man of the highest authority—a medical gentleman of eminence—under whose treatment the man got so rapidly well. That fact is assumed by the witnesses for the defence as the ground upon which to suggest that there was traumatic tetanus in this case. It is a pretence, gentlemen, which has not the shadow of a foundation, and which I should be shrinking from my duty if I did not denounce as altogether unworthy of your attention. There was nothing about the man, according to the statement of all those who were competent to give you an opinion, which would warrant for a single moment the supposition that there was anything in any part of the man's body which could justify the notion of traumatic tetanus; even if there were, the character which his symptoms assumed when the tetanus set in is utterly incompatible, according to the evidence of all the witnesses, with a case of traumatic tetanus. One or two cases of traumatic tetanus have been adduced in evidence on the part of the defence. We had the case of a man who was brought to the London Hospital in the evening, and who died the same night. Yes, but what were the facts of that case? The facts are, that he had had before he was brought in repeated paroxysms; that he felt

premonitory symptoms early in the morning; he was suffering from ulcers of a most aggravated description; and that the symptoms had run their course rapidly it is true, but still the disease was not a matter of minutes, but a matter of hours. There is no other case that I am aware of. There is the case of the boy who was brought in, if it be necessary to allude to it. But there again we have the disease existing for some time before it ends in death. It is a matter there again of hours, and not of minutes, and not a single paroxysm like this was. But it is then suggested that this may have been a case of idiopathic tetanus. Idiopathic tetanus proceeding from what? They say that Mr. Cook was a man of delicate constitution—subject to excitement—that he had something the matter with his chest—that, in addition to having something the matter with his chest—he had this diseased condition of the throat; and, putting all these things together, they say that the man, if he took cold, might get idiopathic tetanus. We are launched into a sea of speculation and of possibilities. Mr. Nunneley, who comes forward here for the purpose of inducing you to believe that there was anything like idiopathic tetanus, goes through a bead-roll of the supposed infirmities of Mr. Cook, and talks about his excitability—talks about his delicacy of chest—talks about the affection of his throat—goes through those various heads, and says that those things may have predisposed him to idiopathic tetanus if he took cold. What evidence is there that he ever did take cold? Not the slightest in the world. The man, from the beginning to the end of the symptoms, was never treated

for cold by anybody, or ever complained that he had taken cold. I cannot help saying to me it seems that it is a scandal upon a learned, a distinguished, and a liberal profession, that men should come forward and put forward such speculations as these, perverting the facts, and drawing from them sophistical and unwarranted conclusions, with the view of deceiving a jury. I have the greatest respect for science—no man can have more—but I cannot repress my indignation and abhorrence when I see it thus perverted and prostituted to the purposes of a particular cause in a court of justice. Do not talk to me about excitement, as Mr. Nunneley did the other day, being the occasion of idiopathic tetanus. You remember the sorts of excitement he spoke of. They are unworthy of your notice, and they were topics discreditable to be put forward by a witness as worthy of the attention of sensible men constituting such a tribunal as you are.

But suppose for a single moment that excitement of this kind could produce any such effect or influence, where is the excitement manifested by Cook as leading to this supposed disease? They say that the man, when his mare won at Shrewsbury, was full of excitement; and well he might be: his fortunes depended upon the result of that race; and I do not deny, for a few minutes he was overpowered by the emotions that the joy of the moment excited in his breast. But that subsided, and we have no further trace of it from that time to the moment of his death. The man passed the rest of the day with his friends in ordinary conversation, and in ordinary enjoyment. No trace of emotion was left about

him. He is taken ill; he goes to Rugeley; he is taken ill there again; is there the slightest symptom of excitement about the man, or, on the other hand, of depression? Not the slightest in the world. When he is ill, like most other people, he is low; but as soon as he gets a little better he is cheerful and happy; he admits his friends, and he converses with them the very night of his death; so far from any excitement, his conversation is full of cheerfulness and mirth—he is laughing and happy, little thinking, poor wretch, of the fate that was impending over him. He is cheerful and happy, talking of the future, not in the language of excitement on the one hand, or of depression on the other. What pretence is there for this idle story of excitement and depression? Not the slightest shadow of foundation in the world. But if there were—if those things were capable of producing that form of tetanus which goes by the term “idiopathic,” the character of the disease is so essentially different that it is impossible to mistake the two. What are the cases which they attempt to set up against it? They have brought you the case of Mary Watson, which a gentleman came all the way from Scotland to tell us about. The girl had been ill all day. She was taken with cramps in the night, probably originating in the stomach, extending to all other parts of her body. She gets well in a very short time, and goes about her business. Is that case to be compared for a single instant to the death agony of that wretched man, and the paroxysm that destroyed him? Those are the sort of cases with which they attempt

to meet such symptoms as those which are spoken to by the witnesses as accompanying the disease of Mr. Cook.

Gentlemen, I venture, upon the evidence, to assert boldly that the cases of idiopathic tetanus and traumatic, or what I may call natural tetanus, are marked by clear and distinct characteristics, distinguishing them from the tetanus produced by strychnia; and I say that the tetanus which accompanied Mr. Cook’s death is not referable to either of those forms of tetanus. You have upon that point the evidence of witnesses of the highest competency, and of the most unquestionable integrity; and upon their evidence I am quite satisfied you can come to no other conclusion but that this was not a case either of idiopathic or of traumatic tetanus. But then they say it may have been something else; and various attempts have been made to set up different causes as capable of producing this tetanic disease. And, first, we have the theory of general convulsions; and Mr. Nunneley, having gone through the bead-roll of the supposed infirmities of Mr. Cook, says, “Oh, this may have been a case of general convulsions; I have known general convulsions to assume a tetanic character.” Well, but pause a moment, Mr. Nunneley; have you ever seen one single case in which death arising from general convulsions, accompanied with tetanic symptoms, has not ended in the unconsciousness of the patient before death? “No, I never knew such a case—not one. But in some book or other, I am told that there is some such case reported;” and he cites, not for that purpose, I think, but he cites,

with reference to general convulsions being sometimes accompanied with tetanic symptoms, and ending in death, a very eminent author of the present day, I mean Dr. Copland. Dr. Copland is living, and Dr. Copland might have been called. The author of the book, I apprehend, would stand before you as a higher authority than a man who merely quotes the book as the foundation of his knowledge. Dr. Copland might have been called. Dr. Copland was not called, notwithstanding the challenge which I threw out. Why? Because it is infinitely better in such a case to call together from the east and from the west practitioners of more or less obscurity, instead of bringing to bear upon the subject the light of science which is treasured up in the breasts of the eminent practitioners with whom this great city abounds. Dr. Copland is not called; but I say, as regards general convulsions, the distinction is plain, that where they destroy the patient they destroy consciousness; and here it is unquestionably the fact, that to the last moment of Mr. Cook's existence, until his bursted heart ceased to beat, his consciousness remained.

But then comes another supposed condition from which death in this form may be said to have resulted, and that is the case which was intended to be set up by a very eminent practitioner, I mean Mr. Partridge. It seems that in the *post-mortem* examination of Mr. Cook, when the spinal marrow was investigated, certain granules were found, and this is seized upon. It is said, "Oh, those granules may have occasioned tetanic convulsions similar to those which were found in Mr. Cook's case," and a very

eminent gentleman is called to give his opinion upon that subject. I admit him to be not only a man of great eminence, but a man of the highest honour and the most perfect veracity. I allude to Mr. Partridge. I must distinguish between him and other of my learned friend's witnesses. Some there were who would not be induced, for any consideration in the world, to swerve from what they believed to be the truth. Mr. Partridge is called here to prove that this was a case of what he called arachnitis, —inflammation of the arachnea in consequence of the granules, or some other abnormal condition. I asked him the symptoms which he would find in such a case. I called his attention to what evidently had not been done before, namely, the symptoms of Mr. Cook's case: and I asked him in simple, straightforward terms whether, looking at those symptoms, he would pledge his opinion, in the face of the medical world and the Court, that this was a case of arachnitis, and he candidly admitted that he would not assert that this was in his opinion a case of arachnitis. Then we have the gentleman who comes all the way from Scotland to inform us, as the next proposition, that Mr. Cook's was a case of epileptic convulsions with tetanic complications. Now, I asked him this question: "Did you ever know a case of epilepsy, with or without tetanic convulsions, in which consciousness was not destroyed before the patient died?" He said, "No; I cannot say that I ever did, but I have read in some book that such a case has occurred."—"Is there anything to make you think that this was epilepsy?" "Well, it may have been epilepsy, because I do not know what else to ascribe

it to; but I must admit that epilepsy is characterised generally by a loss of consciousness." Well, then, what difference would tetanic complication make? That he is unable to explain. I remind you of that species of evidence in which the witnesses resorted to the most speculative reasoning, and put forward the barest possibilities without the shadow of a foundation. But this I undertake to assert, and I refer to the evidence to prove it, that there is not a single case either to which they have spoken as coming within their own experience, or of which they have spoken as the result of reading, in which there were the formidable and decisive symptoms of marked tetanus which existed in this case of Mr. Cook. Having gone through this evidence, I think we have four sets of diseases,—general convulsions, arachnitis, epilepsy proper, and epilepsy with tetanic complication. I expected that we had pretty well exhausted the whole of those scientific theories, but we were destined to have another that assumed the formidable name of angina pectoris. I do not know whether it struck you as remarkable that when my learned friend opened this case for the defence, he never ventured to assert what would be the nature of the disease to which he would endeavour to refer the symptoms of Mr. Cook; and it must, I think, have struck you as a very remarkable thing that no less than four or five distinct and separate theories are set up by the witnesses who appear on the part of the defence,—general convulsions, arachnitis, epilepsy with tetanic complication, and, lastly, angina pectoris. My learned friend had, however, this advantage in not stating to you what was

the theory that his medical witnesses would endeavour to set up, because, one after another, I must admit they took me entirely by surprise. The gentleman who was called yesterday at the last moment, and who talked of angina pectoris, would not have escaped quite so easily if I had had the books to which he referred under my hand, and had been able to expose, as I would have done, the ignorance or the presumption of the assertion which he dared to make. I say ignorance or presumption, or, what is worse, an intention to deceive. I assert it in the face of the whole medical profession, and I am satisfied I shall have their verdict in my favour. But it is a fact which I am entitled to dwell upon, that all those medical witnesses, one and all, differed in the view which they take in this case. There is this remarkable coincidence between the views of some of them and the views of the witnesses whom I called: Mr. Partridge and Dr. Robinson, two of the most respectable witnesses they called, ay, and Dr. Letheby himself, strongly as he was biassed in favour of the defence, being three of the most eminent of the witnesses whom my learned friend brought forward, agreed with the statement made by Sir Benjamin Brodie, and supported by other witnesses whom I brought before you, that in the whole of their experience, that in the whole range of their learning and information, they knew of no known disease to which the symptoms of Mr. Cook could possibly be referred. When such men as those tell us such a fact, I cannot but submit to you that it is impossible to exaggerate its importance.

But then, if it be the fact that

no known disease can account for such symptoms as those of Mr. Cook, and that they are referable to poison alone, can any one entertain a doubt that that poison was the poison of strychnia? The symptoms, at all events from the time the paroxysm set in, are precisely the same. Distinctions are sought to be made by the subtlety of the witnesses for the defence between some of the antecedent symptoms and some of the appearances after death; but I think I shall show you, beyond all possibility of contradiction, that those distinctions are imaginary, and have no foundation in fact. I think I may take this, however, along with me as I go on, that the witnesses called for the defence admit this fact, that from the time the paroxysm set in, of which Mr. Cook died, until the time of the death, the symptoms are precisely similar to the symptoms of tetanus from strychnia. But then they say, and this is worthy of your most attentive consideration, that there are points of difference which have led them to the conclusion, or some of them at all events, that those symptoms could not have resulted from strychnia. Let us see what they are. In the first place, they showed that the period which elapsed between the supposed administration of the poison, and the first appearance of the symptoms, was longer than they have ever observed in animals upon which they have experimented. Now, the first observation which arises there is this, that there is a known difference between animal and human life, in the power with which specific things act upon its organization; and it may well be that the poison administered to a rabbit will produce its effect in a given time; it by no

means follows that it will produce effect in the same time upon an animal of a different description; and still less does it follow that it will exercise its baneful influence in the same time upon a human subject. The whole of the evidence on both sides tends to establish this fact, that not only in individuals of different species, but between individuals of the same species, the same poison and the same dose will produce effects different in degree, different in duration, and different in power. But, again it is perfectly notorious that the rapidity with which the poison begins to work depends materially upon the mode of its administration. If it is administered as a fluid, it acts with great rapidity; if it is administered in a solid state, its effects come on more slowly; and if it is administered in some indurated substance, it will act with still greater tardiness; and if that substance is difficult of solution, then the period will be still longer before the substance having become dissolved is acted upon by the absorbents, and taken up into the system.

Having shown that there was in fact no real discrepancy between the interval, when the pills took effect in Cook's case, and that stated to have been observed in cases of animals, by the witnesses for the defence, the Attorney-General proceeded:—

I cannot for a single moment bring myself to believe, if in all other respects you are perfectly satisfied, that the symptoms, the consequences, and effects were analogous and similar to those produced by strychnia; it is not because those pills may have taken a quarter of an hour or a longer time to manifest their working, it is not

on that account you will hesitate to come to the conclusion that strychnia was administered in this case.

But then they say Yes, but the premonitory symptoms were wanting here. They tell us in animals they observed that the animal manifests first some uneasiness, shrinks, and gathers itself into itself, as it were, avoids movement, and then certain involuntary twitchings about the head come, those being the premonitory symptoms before the paroxysms set in. They say there were no premonitory symptoms in Cook's case. I utterly deny that proposition: I say there were premonitory symptoms of the most marked character, though he did not describe them in language. He is lying in bed—he suddenly starts up in an agony of alarm. What made him do that? was there nothing premonitory, nothing that warned him that the paroxysm was coming? It is clear there must have been. He jumps up in his bed and says, "Fetch me Palmer, I am going to be ill, as I was last night." What was it but that he knew the symptoms that attended him on the previous evening were now warning him of what he might expect in a short period, unless succour could be obtained. He sits up, and he prays to have his neck rubbed. What was the feeling about the neck but a premonitory symptom which was to precede the paroxysm which presently supervened? He says, "Rub my neck, it gives me comfort to have it done."

But here again they take exception, and they say this could not have been tetanus from strychnia, because animals cannot bear to be touched; a touch brings on the paroxysm: not only a touch, but a

breath of air, a sound, a word, a movement of any one near, will bring on a recurrence of the paroxysm. True: but that is after the paroxysm has once been set up, or when it is just about to begin. It is quite clear that those witnesses who come and say that the fact of Mr. Cook having desired to have his neck rubbed is a fact to prove that this could not be a death from tetanus, have either wilfully suppressed the knowledge in their own minds of the evidence they had heard, or they had paid no attention in it; because in two cases of death from strychnia we have shown the patient endured the touching of the limbs and found satisfaction from it. In Mrs. Smyth's case, when her legs were distorted, in the agony of the convulsion she prayed and entreated to have them straightened; she found no additional pain from that operation. The lady at Leeds, in the case which Mr. Nunneley himself attended, implored her husband, between the spasms, to rub her legs and her arms, in order to overcome and subdue their rigidity. That case was under his own knowledge, and in spite of it, although he detected afterwards strychnia in the body of that unhappy woman, he dares to come forward here and say that the fact of Mr. Cook having before the paroxysm tolerated rubbing, and found comfort in it, proves that this could not have been a death from strychnia. What think you of the honesty of such a witness? But there is a third case, which is the case of Mr. Clutterbuck, spoken to by Mr. Moore. That gentleman had taken an overdose of strychnia, and he suffered from all the pains of tetanus; his only comfort was having his limbs

rubbed; and therefore, I say, to contend and to endeavour to persuade a jury that the fact of Cook's having had his neck rubbed proved that this was not tetanus from strychnia, proves, I say, nothing but the dishonesty and insincerity of the witnesses who can dare to put forward such a pretence.

But then they go further, and they say that Mr. Cook was able to swallow. So he was, before the paroxysm came on. Nobody ever pretended that he could swallow after the paroxysm came on. He swallowed the pills, and, what is very curious, and, as they think, bears out and illustrates a part of their theory, is this: it was the act of attempting to swallow the pills—the sort of movement that must have taken place in raising his head and neck for the purpose—that immediately brings on the violent paroxysm of which he died. So far from that in the slightest degree militating against the supposition that this was a case of poisoning by strychnia, it is strongly and decisively conclusive in its favour.

But then they take us to the appearances after death, and they say that there are circumstances to be found which militate against this being a case of strychnia poisoning. Let us see what they are. In the first place, they say the limbs became rigid either at the time of death or immediately after, and that ought not to be found in a case of tetanus from strychnia. Mr. Nunneley says, "In all cases upon which I have experimented I have found the animals become flaccid before death, and they do not become again rigid after it." I can hardly believe that statement, and I certainly was not a little surprised when the very next witness who got into the box (Mr.

Herapath, of Bristol) told us he had made two experiments upon cats, and killed them both. He described them as "indurated and contorted." Those were his expressions when he found them some hours after death. The presence of rigidity in the body at or immediately after death here is put forward on the part of Mr. Nunneley as one of the grounds upon which he says this was not a death by strychnia, although Dr. Taylor had told us that in the case of one of the cats he killed the rigidity after death was such that upon taking the animal by the hind legs and holding it up in the air, the body maintained its horizontal natural position, as though the animal had been upon its four legs upon a plane surface. Notwithstanding that evidence, Mr. Nunneley had the audacity to say that he did not believe this was a case of poisoning by strychnia, because there had been rigidity of the limbs—because the feet were distorted, the hands clenched, and the muscles rigid, as the unhappy man exhibited prior to his death. The very next witness called upon the other side produced two instances in which the animals were indurated from one end of their bodies to the other. As he says they were contorted in all their limbs, and so they remained, it shows what you are to think of the honesty of this sort of evidence, in which facts are selected because they make in favour of the particular hypothesis of the party who brings them forward.

Then the next thing that is said is that the heart in this case was empty. In the animals Mr. Nunneley and Dr. Letheby have operated upon I think the heart has been found full. I do not think

that applies to all the cases; I think they make some exceptions; and, as I said in the outset, it is a remarkable fact connected with the history of this particular poison, that you never can rely upon the precise form or order which the symptoms before death and the appearances after it will assume. There are only certain great, leading, marked, characteristic features—the collateral incidents are capable of infinite variety. We have here the main, marked, characteristic features, and we have, what is more, collateral incidents similar to the cases in which the administration of strychnia, and the fact that death was caused by it, are beyond the possibility of dispute. In the very evidence which has been adduced of two cases of poisoning, Mrs. Smyth's and the Glasgow girl, in both the heart had been found compressed and emptied; and it is obvious to any one who reflects for a single moment that the question whether the heart shall be found congested or the lungs congested must depend upon the immediate cause of death, and we know that in cases of tetanus death may result from more than one cause. All the muscles of the body are subject to the exciting action of this powerful poison, but no one can tell in what order those muscles will be affected, or where the poisonous influence will put forth the fulness of its power. If it act upon the respiratory muscles, and arrest the play of the lungs and with it the breathing of atmospheric air, the result will be that the heart will be left full; but if some spasm seizes on the heart, contracting it and expelling from it the blood that it contains, and so produces death, why, the result will be that the heart will

be found empty and the other vessels gorged with blood. So that you have never perfect certainty as to how those symptoms will manifest themselves after death; but that is again put forward as if the fact of the heart having been found empty is a conclusive fact against death having in this case taken place from strychnia. Yet those men who came here to make those statements as witnesses under the sanction of scientific authority, must have heard both those cases spoken to by the medical gentlemen who examined those two unfortunate patients after death, and who told us that in both cases the heart was found empty. That gets rid of that matter. And so again with regard to the congestion of the brain and other vessels, the same observation applies. If instead of being killed by the action of the poison upon the respiratory muscles or by its action upon the heart, death is the result of a long series of paroxysms exhausting the vital power of the victim, then you expect to find the brain and other vessels congested by those series of convulsions and spasms. As death takes place from one or other of those causes, so will be the appearance of the heart, the brain, and the body after death. There is nothing, I say, in this for a single moment to negative the conclusion which you would otherwise arrive at from the symptoms which appeared in this man's body at the time of his death and immediately afterwards—that those are the symptoms of tetanus of the strongest and most aggravated kind; that is a proposition about which, I think, you can entertain no doubt. If so, are they referable to tetanus of any other de-

scription? Certainly not; because, as Sir Benjamin Brodie told you, the course of the symptom is marked by characteristics of unquestionable difference.

Is it not then preposterous to contend that this was not a case of tetanus? And if every one of the distinctions they have attempted to set up I show you to have really nothing to do with the case (because I produce you at once an undoubted case in which the administration of strychnia is beyond the reach of question, in which those particular symptoms and appearances were manifested and observed), I get rid at once of all those vain, futile attempts to distinguish this case, either in its premonitory symptoms or in the appearances either before or upon *post-mortem* examination. I get rid of all those difficulties, and I come back to the symptoms which attended this unhappy man's demise. I ask whether you can doubt that, when I have excluded all those cases of tetanic convulsions, epilepsy, and arachnitis, or angina pectoris, which occurred, you recollect, in a young girl after an attack of scarlet fever—in all human probability the scarlet fever had been thrown back upon the system, and had produced all those consequences—when I exclude all those cases, and then lastly exclude traumatic or idiopathic tetanus, what remains? The tetanus of strychnia, and the tetanus of strychnia only. I pray your attention to the cases of which evidence has been given, in which there was no question as to strychnia having been administered, there not being the shadow of a doubt about it, and in which the circumstances were so similar, and the symptoms so analogous, that I

think you cannot hesitate to come to the conclusion that this was death by strychnia. Medical witnesses of the highest authority, both on the part of the Crown and on the part of the defence, agree that in the whole range of their experience and knowledge they know of no natural disease to which these remarkable symptoms can be referred. If that be so, and there is a known poison that will produce them, how strong, how cogent, how irresistible becomes the inference that to that poison, and to that poison alone, are those symptoms and this death to be ascribed!

Nevertheless, gentlemen, on the other hand, the case is not without its difficulties; and I will not shrink from the discussion of them, nor from the candid recognition of those difficulties, so far as they in reality exist. Strychnia was not found in this body; and we have it no doubt upon strong evidence, that in a variety of experiments which have been tried upon the bodies of animals killed by strychnia, strychnia has been detected by the tests which science places at the disposition of scientific men. If strychnia had been found, of course there would have been no difficulty, and we should have had none of the ingenious theories which gentlemen from a variety of parts have been brought forward to propound in this court. The question for your consideration is, whether the absence of its detection leads conclusively to the view that this death could not have been caused by the administration of that poison. Now, in the first place, under what circumstances was the examination made of which Dr. Taylor and Dr. Rees have spoken? They tell you

that when the stomach of this man was brought to them for the purpose of analysis, it was presented to them under the most unfavourable circumstances. They say that its contents had been lost, and that they had no opportunity of experimenting upon them. It is very true that those who put up the jar make a statement somewhat different. They say that the contents of the stomach were emptied into the jar, but there appears at all events (I will not put it higher than accident), by accident, to have been some spilling of the contents; and there is, I think, the clearest and most undeniable evidence of very considerable bungling in the way in which the stomach was cut, and the way in which it was emptied into the jar. It was cut from end to end, says Dr. Taylor. It was tied up at both ends; it had been turned inside out into the contents of the intestines, and lay there in a mass of feculent matter, and was therefore in a condition the most unsatisfactory for analysis and experiment. It is very true that the witnesses upon the other side—Mr. Nunneley, Mr. Herapath, and Dr. Letheby—say that, no matter how contaminated or how mixed with impurities, they should have been able to ascertain the presence of strychnia in the stomach, if strychnia ever had been there. I own I should have more confidence in the testimony of those witnesses if their partiality and partisanship had not been so much marked as they are. I should have more confidence in the testimony of Mr. Herapath, if he had not been constrained to admit to me a fact which had come to my knowledge, that he has again and again asserted that this case was a

case of poisoning by strychnia, but that Dr. Taylor had not known how to find it out: he admits that that is a statement he has again and again made.

Mr. Serjeant Shee.—It was in the newspapers, he said.

Mr. Attorney-General.—He did not venture to say that the newspaper statement in any way differed from the fact which he admitted in this court. I have seen that gentleman not merely contenting himself with coming forward, when called upon for the purpose of justice, to state that which he knew as a matter of science or of experiment, but I have seen him mixing himself up as a thoroughgoing partisan in this case, advising my learned friend, suggesting question upon question, and that in behalf of a man whom he has again and again asserted he believed to be a poisoner by strychnia. I do not say that alters the fact; but I do say that it induces one to look at the credit of those witnesses with a very great amount of suspicion. I reverence a man who, from a sense of justice and a love of truth—from those high considerations which form the noblest elements in the character of man—comes forward in favour of a man against whom the world may run in a torrent of prejudice and aversion, and who stands and states what he believes to be the truth; but I abhor the traffic in testimony to which, I regret to say, men of science sometimes permit themselves to condescend. I ask you, therefore, to look at the statements of those witnesses with dispassionate consideration before you attach implicit credit to them. But let me assume that all they say is true, that it is the fact that they in their experiments have succeeded in dis-

covering strychnia when mixed with other impurities, and contaminated, no matter by what cause—they say that no extent of putrefaction, no amount of decomposition, will alter the character of that vegetable matter, so that it may not be detected if it is in the human stomach. Be it so. But, then, must it always be found in every case where death has ensued? Professor Taylor says no; and he says it would be a most dangerous and mischievous proposition to assert that that must necessarily be so—that it would enable many a guilty man to escape who, by administering the smallest quantity whereby life can be affected and destroyed, might by that means prevent the possibility of the detection of the poison in the stomach of the individual. All the witnesses seem to agree in this, or at all events the great bulk of them agree in this, that the poison acts after it has been absorbed into the system; taken up by the absorbents of the stomach, it is carried into the blood; passing by means of the circulation through the tissues, it is deposited there; at some stage or other of its progress it affects the nervous system; and as soon as the nerves, affecting the muscles of motion, become influenced by its baneful power, then come on those muscular spasms and convulsions of which we have heard so much. If the minimum dose be given, and that operates by absorption, it is perfectly clear—and must be clear—that the whole must be taken up by absorbents and pass into the blood, and that none, therefore, will be found in the stomach. Nay, a further proposition is also clear. If it is necessary that it should be first passed by means of the circulation

into the solid tissues of the body, before it acts upon the nervous system, it will cease to be found in the blood. Again, a portion of it, if in excess, will be eliminated in the kidneys, and pass off in watery secretion. You do not know, therefore, in what part of the human body to put your hand upon it. But this is undoubtedly the fact, if there has been an excess over the quantity necessary to destroy the life of a particular individual, then, as soon as the absorbents have taken up the necessary quantity, the nervous system will at once be affected and life destroyed; you will find the excess in the stomach, if you adopt the proper means of seeking for it. Now, what did these gentlemen do? They gave never less than a grain—often as much as two grains; and yet we now know that a quarter of a grain is enough to destroy a small animal like a rabbit, and that no man could venture to hope for life who took half a grain or three-quarters of a grain of it. Therefore, in the cases of their experiments, and experiments made, allow me to say, for the purpose of this cause, after those parties had been retained—I use the word “retained,” for it is the appropriate word: no parties can be more thoroughgoing partisans than scientific men who have once taken up a case—after they have been retained for this case, and desire that their experiments should have a certain result, they take good care to have doses large enough to leave a small portion in the stomach. But be this as it may, I have only now to deal with the experiments of Professor Taylor and Dr. Rees; they may, for aught I know, be a pair of bunglers—it is no part of my business to uphold them if their professional

reputation will not do it; but they tell us that they tried its effects upon four animals of the same species with fully adequate doses. Where they administered two grains they reproduced the poison in abundance; where they administered one grain they found a small indication of it; and when they administered half a grain to two rabbits they found no traces of the poison at all. It may well be that that may result, as Mr. Herapath says, from Professor Taylor not knowing the right way of going about it. It may be, if Mr. Herapath had had the stomach under his more scientific manipulation, he would have produced the strychnia. It is enough for my purpose when, as I show, the man who did in this case experiment upon the stomach of Mr. Cook, in two cases out of four, when he had given a smaller dose to rabbits, failed to reproduce the poison. What is the conclusion I draw from it? Why, that although I cannot have the advantage here which the positive detection of the strychnia would have afforded if it had been found, there is no room for the opposite conclusion — the converse of the proposition for which my learned friend and his witnesses contend — that the fact of the strychnia not having been reproduced or discovered affords negative conclusive proof that the death was not produced by strychnia. I have no positive proof on the one hand, but on the other hand my learned friend is in the same predicament — he cannot say that he has negative proof conclusive of the fact of this death not having taken place by strychnia.

But now is there no other evidence in the case? Do I ask you to come to the conclusion that

he administered strychnia to his friend, simply because the symptoms of that friend's death are reconcilable with no known form of disease which the most enlarged experience or knowledge can supply? No, gentlemen, it does not rest there. Not because those symptoms are precisely those which show themselves in cases of poisoning by strychnia. No, the case does not rest there; I wish it did: but, alas! it does not. I must now draw your serious attention to a part of the case which has not been met, and has not been grappled with. My learned friend said that he would contest the ground with the prosecution foot by foot. Alas! we are upon that ground upon which, as it were, is centered the crisis of this momentous question; and, alas! my learned friend has not grappled with it for an instant. We have here a death of which the dread manifestations bore upon their face the character of strychnia poisoning. Was the prisoner at the bar possessed of that poison? Did he obtain it upon the eve of the death into which we are inquiring? These are matters of fearful moment. They are matters with which it behoved my learned friend indeed to have grappled with all the vigour of which he was capable and with all the means that his case afforded. But I grieve to say that this part of the case is left untouched as regards the defence. Did the prisoner at the bar obtain possession of strychnia on the Monday late? Did he get it again upon the Tuesday morning? The fact of his having got it on the Monday night rests, it is true, upon the evidence of an individual whose statement, as I said to you in the onset, and as I

repeat now, requires at your hands the most careful and anxious attention before you adopt it easily. [The Attorney-General commented at some length on the evidence of Newton, insisting that it had been so far corroborated by collateral evidence as to be proved worthy of credence.] My learned friend, with justice and with propriety, has asked for your most attentive consideration to the question of motives involved in this case. Before you can charge a man with having taken away the life of another by aforethought and deliberate malice, it does become important to see whether there were motives that could operate upon him to do so foul a deed. That does not apply to this witness, for, even though the hideous crime of taking life by poison is not perhaps so horrible to contemplate as the notion of judicial murder effected by false witness against a man's neighbour, can you suppose that this young man can have the remotest shadow of a motive for coming forward upon this occasion, under the solemn sanction of an oath, in a court of justice like this, to take away the life—for alas! if you believe his evidence, it must take away the life—of the prisoner at the bar? If you believe that on the night of Monday, for no other conceivable or assignable purpose except the deed of darkness which was to be done that night upon the person of Mr. Cook, the prisoner at the bar went to Newton and obtained from him the fatal and deadly instrument whereby life was to be destroyed, it is impossible that you can come to any other conclusion than that the prisoner is guilty, and that your verdict must pronounce him so.

But it does not stop there. On

the morrow of that day we have the clearest and most unquestioned evidence that Mr. Palmer bought more strychnia. He went to Mr. Hawkins's shop, and there purchased six grains more, and the circumstances attending that purchase are peculiar in the extreme. He comes to the shop, and he gives an order for prussic acid, and, having got his prussic acid, he gives an order for strychnia. Before the strychnia is put up, Newton, the same man, comes into the shop. What does the prisoner do? He immediately takes Newton by the arm, and says he has something particular to say to him, and takes him to the door. What was it he had to say to him? Was it anything particular? Was it anything of the slightest importance? Was it anything that might not have been said in the presence of Roberts, who was putting up the strychnia. Certainly not. It was to ask a most unimportant question, namely, when young Mr. Salt was going to the farm which he had taken at Sudbury. In that question there could be nothing which might not be put in the presence of anybody, no matter who. He takes him to the door, and then puts this question. At the same time a man of the name of Brassington, a cooper, comes up, and Brassington had something to say to Newton upon business, having some bills against Newton's employer, Mr. Salt. Upon that Brassington and Newton get into conversation at some little distance from the door. The prisoner immediately takes advantage of those two being in conversation, and he goes back and completes the purchase of the strychnia. But while the strychnia was being made up he stands in the doorway with his

back to the shop, and his face to the street, where he would have a perfect command of the persons of Newton and Brassington, and where, if Newton had quitted Brassington to return into the shop, the prisoner would at once have been in a position to take every possible step for not letting Newton go in, by renewing the conversation with him until the strychnia had been taken away. I ask you, having this description of the transaction given to you by Roberts in the first place, confirmed by Newton afterwards, can you entertain any reasonable doubt that the prisoner was desirous of not letting Newton know that he was purchasing strychnia there? You can very well understand that he would be desirous of keeping that fact from Newton, because, if it be true that Newton had let him have three grains the night before, Newton's attention would be naturally immediately aroused by so strange a circumstance, because nine grains of strychnia were enough—three grains were enough—to kill three, perhaps six people. What could a man want with nine grains of strychnia in so short a space of time? It would attract Newton's attention, and it did; for Newton immediately went and asked what he wanted there, his attention being in the first place directed, not so much to what he had come to purchase as to the singularity of his coming there at all, because for two years past the prisoner never bought an article of any sort or kind at the shop of Mr. Hawkins. His former assistant, Mr. Thirlby, had two years before set up in business as a chemist, and from that time, naturally enough, Mr. Palmer had withdrawn his custom from Mr. Hawkins, and

had given it to his former assistant Mr. Thirlby. It was a remarkable thing that he should go to Mr. Hawkins's shop upon this occasion to get strychnia. Why did he not go to Mr. Thirlby? I will tell you. Mr. Thirlby would have known perfectly well that he could have no legitimate use for such an article. Mr. Thirlby had taken his practice. Mr. Palmer was no longer in practice, except in the circle of his relatives and his own immediate friends; and if he had gone to Mr. Thirlby for strychnia, Mr. Thirlby would have said naturally enough, "What are you going to do with it?" and therefore he did not go to Mr. Thirlby. Why he should have gone to purchase strychnia (I agree with my learned friend, it is one of the mysteries of this case) on two successive days I cannot tell; but that he did is undeniably true; and if on the one hand some little difficulty arises, on the other hand is not the difficulty infinitely greater in accounting for the motive that induced him to go and get this strychnia either on the Monday night or upon the Tuesday? If it was for the purpose of professional use for the benefit of some patient for whom small doses of strychnia might have been advantageous, where is the patient, and why is he not produced? My learned friend did not even advert to the question of the second purchase of strychnia in the whole of his powerful observations. He passes it over in mysterious but significant silence. Account for that six grains of strychnia, the purchase of which is an undoubted and indisputable fact. Throw doubt if you please—I blame you not for it—upon the story of the purchase on the previous night; but on the Tuesday it

is unquestionably true that six grains of strychnia were purchased. Purchased for whom? purchased for what? If for any patient, who is that patient? Produce him. If for any other purpose, at least let us have it explained. Has there been the slightest shadow of an attempt at explanation? Alas! I grieve to say, none at all. Something was said, in the outset of this case, about some dogs that had been troublesome in the paddocks where the mares and foals were, but that proved to have been in September. If there had been any recurrence of such a thing, where are the grooms who had the care and charge of those mares and foals, and why are they not here to state the fact? If this poison was used for the purpose of destroying dogs, some one must have assisted Mr. Palmer in the attempts which he resorted to for that purpose. Where are those persons? Why are they not called? But, not only are they not called, they are not even named. My learned friend does not venture to breathe even a suggestion of anything of the kind. I ask, gentlemen, what conclusion can we draw from these things, except one, and one alone? Death with all the symptoms of strychnia—death in all the convulsive agonies and throes which that fatal poison produces in the frame of man—death with all the appearances which follow upon death, and mark how that death has come to pass—all these things in the minds of those who can discuss and consider them with calm, dispassionate attention, who do not mix themselves up as advocates, partisans, or witnesses, leading to but one conclusion; and then the fact of the strychnia being pur-

chased by the prisoner on the morning of the fatal day, if not obtained by him, as was sworn to, on the night before, is left wholly uncovered and wholly unmet, without the shadow of a defence. Alas! gentlemen, is it possible that we can come to any other than one painful and dread conclusion? I protest I can suggest to you none.

The Attorney-General then commented on the argument that Palmer had no need to have bought strychnia in Rugeley on Tuesday night, seeing that he might have bought it in London. He insisted that one reason might be that a London chemist would not have sold a poison without the name of the purchaser; and another that Palmer was so much harassed by the necessity of his arrangement with Herring to secure Cook's winnings, and buy off the ruin that impended, that he had not time to make the purchase. However that might be, that Palmer did buy strychnia on Tuesday night was a proved fact. The Attorney-General also combated the argument in favour of the prisoner, that he had called in two medical men, arguing that he had taken such steps to deceive those persons, and that he had actually succeeded in deceiving them, into the belief that Cook's illness was entirely due to natural causes.

Alas! gentlemen, it does not stop there: there is another part of this case which, though it may not have been the means of death, is of the highest value in estimating the credit that is to be given to the point which we advance of this death having been produced by strychnia—I allude to the anti-mony. We have had medical men and analytical chemists who have told us a great deal about strychnia.

nia, but not one has said a word about antimony. On the Wednesday night, at Shrewsbury, when Cook drinks his glass of brandy-and-water he fancies there is something in it that burns his throat; he exclaims at the time, and he is seized immediately with vomiting, which lasts for several hours. On that same night Mrs. Brookes sees the prisoner shaking something in a glass, evidently dissolving something in fluid. A man has been called here to-day, the boon companion, the chosen associate, the racing confederate of the prisoner, to come and tell you that all that story is untrue—that the woman never came down-stairs—that Palmer never carried out the brandy-and-water—that there is not a word of truth in it—and the fact is that Palmer and Cook only came in at 12 o'clock, when Myatt forsooth had been waiting for two hours. Mrs. Brookes's story is, according to him, an entire invention from beginning to end; he swears that he must have seen if anything had been mixed with the brandy-and-water, and nothing was mixed with it. I think you will be more disposed to believe Mrs. Brookes than to believe any of those persons who were the associates of the prisoner, and who had been partners in his transactions. It is a remarkable fact that Cook drinks that brandy-and-water and a few minutes after is taken ill. There were other persons taken ill at Shrewsbury; it may be within the verge of possibility—although ten minutes after he had drunk the brandy-and-water he was taken with vomiting—that it was the same form of complaint to which other persons were subject in Shrewsbury; I do not want to press it one jot further than it

ought to go, but it is a remarkable circumstance that the man is seen with a glass and with a fluid which he is mixing up and holding to the light, and shortly afterwards his friend who is drinking with him or drinking at the same table at which he is drinking, who, if Myatt be telling the truth, was somewhat in liquor and ought not to have been pressed to take brandy-and-water—Palmer says that he will not take anything until Cook has exhausted his portion—and then immediately afterwards the man is taken ill. These are circumstances not altogether incapable of producing certain impressions upon one which it is difficult to shake off.

Nevertheless, I pass on from that, and go to Rugeley. From the Saturday morning until the Monday morning I find this poor man suffering under the influence of constant vomiting; that was not the Shrewsbury disease—he had got rid of it; he was well on Thursday and he was well on Friday. On Saturday morning, after dining at Mr. Palmer's, he is taken ill; and then we have the fact of Mr. Palmer administering his food, administering his remedies, sending over toast-and-water, sending over broth; and, no sooner has this poor man taken those things than he is seized with incessant vomitings of the most painful description. What about the broth? The broth is said to-day by Smith to have been sent from the Albion. Yes; and where does it find its way to? It is taken, not to the Talbot Arms, but to the prisoner's kitchen. After that, instead of leaving it, as one would suppose he would leave it, to the woman to take to the Talbot Arms, he takes it himself from the fire, puts it

into the cup, gives it to her, it is taken over, and the man vomits immediately after he has drunk it. On the Sunday the same thing is done again; the broth is brought from the same quarter, and attended with the same results. Of that broth the woman takes a couple of spoonfuls, and she is sick for several hours. She vomits twenty times, and is unable to leave her bed for some hours. My learned friend said she did not state that before the coroner. Nevertheless, it is sworn to by the other servant that the woman was ill. I can quite understand why the woman did not state it before the coroner. It shows the honesty of the woman's character. It did not occur to her to connect the sickness from which she suffered with the taking of the broth; but afterwards, when the story of the antimony came up, and Cook's sickness was connected with it, then she remembered perfectly well, after the evidence had been given, how she, having taken the broth, immediately became ill. The fact is not one capable of dispute, although it may be that she did not mention it before the coroner. And I think you will regard it as a very important and significant fact in the case, that, on the Monday, when Palmer is absent, Cook is better. On the Tuesday he vomits again, though not in the same degree. But after death—now comes the important fact—antimony is found in the tissues of that man's body, and his blood shows the presence of it; the blood shows distinctly that it must have been taken recently, within the last eight-and-forty hours previously to his death. How came it there? The small quantity that is found does not form the slightest criterion of the

quantity that had been administered to him. Part of it, you know, would be thrown up by the act of vomiting which it provokes; part of it would pass away in other forms, but none would be there unless he had taken some. When did he take it? If you find that he is suffering from vomiting for days before his death—that a person is constantly administering things to him, and after taking those things he vomits—when the prisoner sends him over a basin of broth he vomits, and when the servant takes a couple of spoonfuls she is reduced to the same condition—what other conclusion can you come to, knowing that antimony is an irritant that will produce vomiting and retching in the human system, than that the antimony must have been administered to him by some one? By whom? Who but the prisoner at the bar could have done it? My learned friend says, Cook might have taken antimony at some former time—that he might have taken James's powder for a cold. There is not the slightest trace of evidence from the beginning to the end of the case that he ever had a cold, or ever took James's powder, over the whole period we are now ranging. Moreover, as I have even now said, it was in his blood, it must have been administered eight-and-forty hours before death; who could have administered it but the prisoner at the bar? I ask you to form your own judgment upon that matter, but I cannot resist the conclusion, it is irresistible. If so, for what purpose was it administered? it is difficult to say with anything like precision; one can only speculate upon it. It may have been, however, to produce the appearance of natural disease, to account for the

calling in of medical men, and to account for the catastrophe which was already in preparation; but it may also have had another and a different object, and it is this: if we are right as to the motives which impelled the prisoner at the bar to commit this great crime, it was, at all events in part, that he might possess himself of the money which Cook would have to realise upon the settling-day at Tattersall's, on Monday. If Cook went there himself the scheme was frustrated; Mr. Cook intended to go there himself, and if he had done so the prisoner's designs would have failed of accomplishment. To make him ill at Shrewsbury—to get him in consequence to go to Rugeley, instead of going to London or anywhere else—to make him ill again and keep him ill at Rugeley, might be part of a cleverly contrived and organised scheme. It might have been with one or other of those motives, it might have been with both, that the antimony was administered, and so sickness produced, but that the sickness was produced and that the antimony was afterwards found in the body are incapable of dispute. Put them together and you have cause and effect; and if you are satisfied that antimony was introduced into that poor man's body for the purpose of producing vomiting and sickness, then I say there is no one who could have given it to him within that recent period but the prisoner at the bar. Neither the doctor at Shrewsbury, nor the doctor at Rugeley, ever gave him one fraction of antimony which had those natural effects which as a cause it was certain to produce: then it will be for you to ask yourselves whether it can have been with any

other than a fell purpose and design—with a view of paving the way for the more important act which was afterwards to follow. [The Attorney-General then commented on the conduct of Palmer in regard to the pills supplied by Dr. Bamford; his ordering a shell and coffin without the knowledge of Mr. Stevens; and the conversation with Newton respecting the effect of strychnia on a dog; all which are set out in the opening address.] But then my learned friend says that the man had no motive to take away the life of his friend, and it is right we should see how that matter stands. Gentlemen, if indeed I have satisfied you, beyond the reach of reasonable doubt, by the evidence I have adduced, and by the failure on the part of the evidence for the defence to neutralize its effect, that the death here was occasioned by strychnia—that the strychnia could have been administered by no one, and in fact was administered by no one, save Mr. Palmer—the question of motive becomes a matter of secondary consideration. It is often difficult to dive into the breasts of men, to understand the motives that have been working there, and by those motives to account for their actions. Omniscience alone can exercise that faculty and that power; and therefore, where acts are proved against a man beyond the reach of reasonable doubt, it is not because we may not be able to exercise a sufficiently scrutinising power to ascertain the motives, that we are to doubt the facts, the existence of which is brought beyond the reach of reasonable doubt; but nevertheless it is always an important element in a case, and it is above all an important element

in a case upon which any reasonable doubt can by possibility rest, to see whether there was an adequate motive to lead to the perpetration of the act which is charged. On the other hand, gentlemen, we must not be too precise in weighing the question of the adequacy of motive; that which, to the good, would appear of no influence, however remote or minute, in inducing them to commit crime, oftentimes, with the wicked, is quite sufficient to impel them into crime, and it may have been so here. But let us see, before I make any further observations upon that point, how the matter stands upon the proof which is before us. I told you that Mr. Palmer was a man in circumstances of the direst embarrassment, with ruin actually staring him in the face, and that nothing could avert that ruin save pecuniary means at once obtained for his purpose. The proof which I have offered to you has fully come up to the proposition with which I started. The fact has been proved beyond the possibility of doubt. It appears that in the month of November, 1855, Mr. Palmer was in this position. He owed upon bills, all of which were forged, the sum of 19,000*l.*; he had bills to the amount of 12,500*l.* standing in the hands of Mr. Pratt; he had bills to the amount of 6500*l.* standing in the hands of Mr. Wright; and he had a bill for 2000*l.* in the hands of Mr. Padwick. Although it is true that 1000*l.* upon that account had been paid off to Mr. Pratt, yet the bills still remained for the full amount in Mr. Pratt's hands. Although 1000*l.* had been paid to Mr. Padwick, he held a warrant of attorney and a bill of sale upon the stud for the remaining 1000*l.* All

those bills, without exception, were forgeries. A correspondence took place between Mr. Pratt and himself with regard to the 13,000*l.* policy upon his brother's death, through which he hoped to liquidate Mr. Pratt's demand; he had been disappointed of that money, and upon the office declining to pay the money, as early as the middle of October Mr. Pratt gave him to understand, in the most distinct and positive terms, that the bills must be met. Bills for 4000*l.* were due, or were coming due, at the end of that month: one upon the 25th for 2000*l.*, and another upon the 27th for 2000*l.* Bills already renewed were coming due from month to month, and there was 5500*l.* which it was necessary immediately to provide for. Mr. Pratt gave him notice that he could give him no longer delay, inasmuch as the office had resolved to dispute this policy. It was no longer an existing valid security, and consequently Mr. Pratt could not be a party to representing to his clients, with whose money those bills had been discounted, that it was in any respect a valid security, therefore the bills must be met. The matter was coming to a crisis; the bills must be paid at maturity; he sends him up three small sums, first a sum of 300*l.*, and then two sums of 250*l.* each, making the sum of 800*l.* Of that sum 200*l.* was to come off other bills to fall due in January, leaving only 600*l.* applicable to the principal. He is told at once that he must do a great deal more; he is told, late in October, that unless he does a great deal more writs will be issued against his mother and against himself, which would at once bring the matter to a termi-

nation by showing that those bills were forgeries. He entreats that time shall be given; he obtains this concession from Mr. Pratt, that the writs shall not be served until a given day, and he in the interval must make further payments on account of the principal bill due. That being the state of things, upon the 13th Mr. Pratt writes and presses him for further payment. On that day Polestar won. Cook was, as you have heard, in an ecstasy of delight, feeling that his difficulties were, at all events for a time, removed; that he should now get through the winter and live happily till the next racing season. He little thought what was about to take place. If this accusation is well founded, the mare winning, and his being entitled to a large sum of money, was the most fatal thing that could have befallen him. Alas! how great is the shortsightedness of mortal man! When we have the highest cause of joy and exultation, often while the sunshine of our prosperity warms and gladdens our heart for a moment, there is lurking beneath our feet a fatal abyss, into which we are about to fall. This poor man, if this charge be true, might have been living now, had it not been that upon that fatal day his mare won, and he became entitled to a large sum of money, which afforded temptation to his murderer.

Now it becomes perfectly clear that at this moment matters were approaching to an immediate crisis. What was Mr. Palmer to do? He had no source to which to turn for money. It is clear that he could not go to his mother. I presume that source had long since been exhausted, or he would

not have forged her name. What was he to do if he could not get money to satisfy Pratt's demand? You know, although a money-lender is considerate and indulgent enough as long as he is certain of his payment, and gets his heavy usurious interest paid down to the nail, if he once becomes doubtful of the security, and uncertain of payment, you may as well ask mercy of a rabid tiger, or you may as well ask pity of stones, as hope to find bowels of compassion in him. Pratt gave him fair warning that the money must be paid, or something must be paid by way of instalment on the principal, and to keep the interest down. Where was Mr. Palmer to get money from? My learned friend says Cook was his best friend, and that Cook was the man he was to look to; and that as long as he kept Cook alive he had a friend in need to whom he could resort for assistance. In what way? Was Cook to give acceptances to Pratt? Is anybody weak enough to suppose that Pratt would have taken Cook's acceptances to keep those bills alive, unless there was a part payment of the principal and interest? It is quite clear that he would not. When even for the sum of 500*l.* he was asked to take Cook's security, he refused to do so, unless there was the collateral security of an assignment of his horses. Cook had assigned to him all the property he possessed. All that Cook had in the world was his winnings upon that day's race at Shrewsbury, and what little money he may have obtained by his winnings at the races at Worcester. If you believe the witness Myatt, those winnings were exhausted, and therefore this man had nothing except his winnings

at the Shrewsbury races ; and you are asked by my learned friend to believe that it would have been of use to Palmer to keep this man alive ; the reverse is proved by the evidence. With Pratt his personal security would have been unavailing. Pratt tells you that he would not take anything from him unless it was the real security of an assignment of his horses or other property. Just see the interest which Palmer had in securing all Cook's effects. My learned friend says they were mixed up together in transactions in which they had a joint and common interest — they were confederates upon the turf, and had joint bets together. Yes ; but one man putting another on does not mean that when A. puts B. on and says we are likely to make a good thing, and we will share it, that B. is to pay A.'s losings if they do not win. They might be confederates on the turf, but that did not make Cook responsible for Palmer's liabilities. Does any one suppose that Cook intended to find the means to enable Palmer to meet Pratt's insatiable demands, to stave off the difficulties in that quarter ? Was Cook to deprive himself of his winnings, and leave himself without money, for the benefit of his friend ? That is the proposition, for the whole of which my learned friend must contend before he can establish anything like a case to show that if Cook had lived it would have been better for Palmer than that he should die. My learned friend says there is proof that they were mixed up closely together to be found in this, that Cook writes to his agent Fisher, and says to Fisher, writing on the Friday after he had dined

VOL. XCVIII.

with Palmer, " There is a matter which is of importance to Palmer and to me, that 500*l.* should be paid to Mr. Pratt to-morrow ; 300*l.* has been sent down to-night, and I request you will be so good as to pay Mr. Pratt 200*l.* to-morrow on my account, and charge it to me." My learned friend thought that that transaction would be favourable to his client, and he put it prominently forward. To my mind he could have adduced nothing more fatal. The explanation of it is to me as clear as the sun at noonday. Cook had brought with him some 600*l.* or 700*l.* ; at least at Shrewsbury he was seen by Fisher with a roll of notes amounting to some 700*l.* or 800*l.* On that same evening the parties come to Rugeley, when he had not had time to spend the money. He speaks of a 500*l.* transaction, in which he and Palmer have a joint interest. There is only that one transaction with Pratt in which they had a common interest, that was the 500*l.* raised by the assignment of Polestar, and a bill, of which we say Cook never got the proceeds ; and he says, writing on that night to Fisher, " 300*l.* have been sent up to-night, and I will be obliged to you to pay the other 200*l.* to make up the whole." No 300*l.* were ever sent up that night. Mr. Pratt has given an account of the whole transaction. 300*l.* were to be sent that night ; by whom were they to be sent ? Can you doubt ? Where is all Cook's money gone ? I can quite understand that he handed over 300*l.* to Palmer to send up to Pratt, and directed Fisher to pay another 200*l.* What followed in respect to the joint transaction ? What was the joint transaction ? they never had but

LL

one, and that was for 500*l*. What was it? Why, it was the money which had been got by the assignment of Polestar and Sirius; Polestar had just won at Shrewsbury—it was natural that the man should desire to redeem his mare; moreover the bill was coming due; he had the cash in his pocket, and he knew that he was going to receive money at Tattersall's, which he never did; and he says, “300*l*. will be sent up to-night:” it is the only matter in which they have a common interest, not only as to the 500*l*., but in any respect; Pratt had no other dealing whatever with them jointly or with Cook, if we except the bill for 500*l*.: what does it show? It shows that 300*l*. had been sent for the purpose—he sends up 300*l*., but how is it applied? Pause for a moment; the 300*l*. is not sent up, Palmer keeps it in his pocket; what is done with the other 200*l*.? is it carried to the account of the matter in which they had joint interest with Pratt? no such thing; it goes as part of the payment made by Palmer to Pratt on account of the bills which Pratt then held—it never went to any matter of joint interest—it is an idle and false pretence to say that Cook was in any way responsible to Pratt; it may have been the intention of Palmer when Cook should be no more to represent him as so, but there is no foundation in reality and in fact for the statement. I say the transaction of the 500*l*., so far from helping the prisoner's case, shows conclusively that the 200*l*. advanced by Fisher, and the 300*l*. to be sent up that night to satisfy this bill for 500*l*., and the assignment to release Polestar and Sirius, was 500*l*. more taken from this young

man and appropriated by the prisoner to his own use.

But the matter does not rest there—would it did. I come now to the transaction of the Monday, and I find 1020*l*. of Cook's money applied to the prisoner's use. He goes up to London; he had ascertained by some means or other the amount that Cook was entitled to receive on the Monday—possibly Cook had told him; Fisher was Cook's agent, and the probability is that Cook desired the prisoner to hand an account of his bets which he had won to Fisher, who would go and settle with the parties at Tattersall's; Fisher would have to pay himself back the 200*l*.; we know that he intended his accounts should pass through Fisher, because he asked Fisher to advance the 200*l*. upon the credit of it; but it is suggested that under the guidance of Palmer he now meditated a fraud, and that he intended to pass his account through Mr. Herring, in order to avoid paying Fisher the 200*l*. for a time. Is it charitable to Mr. Cook to ascribe to him a fraud of this description, which, so far as we know, he was not in the habit of doing? I ask you this question as reasonable men, supposing he had disposed of his ready money, and we find none left—that he had given the prisoner 300*l*. to send up, you cannot suppose that this man who had nothing of his fortune left, who sees ruin staring him in the face—he was not a ruined man as long as he had this money, but having parted with this money he was a ruined man—you cannot suppose that he intended to deprive himself of the whole of the money that he had won, to leave himself destitute and naked for the coming

winter; the thing is out of the question: besides, if the prisoner's representation is true which he made to Mr. Cheshire, that he had got the genuine cheque of this man for very nearly the amount, through his agents Messrs. Wetherby, of the stakes at Shrewsbury, you are asked to believe on the one hand that he had given him his ready money, and on the other hand that he had given him a cheque to receive of Messrs. Wetherby, and that he had given him 1020*l.* which constituted absolutely the whole that the poor man possessed—you are asked to believe that he hands it over to the prisoner to go and dispose of as he pleases: that is my learned friend's proposition, but I do not think you will adopt it.

Then if that be not so, what does the prisoner do? He goes to London, but does not go to Fisher, who was the agent of Cook, who would in the first place have paid himself back the 200*l.*, and in the second place would not have paid the sums which he received except Cook's upon authority and instruction, but would have sent the money to Cook, or have paid it upon Cook's written direction as to what was to be done with it. He takes the account, therefore, to a comparative stranger, who never had acted for Mr. Cook before, feeling that that stranger would have no hesitation or repugnance in paying the money according to the direction of the man from whom he had the direction to receive it, supposing that both emanated from Mr. Cook, the person interested in the money. Accordingly he says to Mr. Herring, "Here is a list of bets which Cook will be entitled to be paid at Tattersall's; they are so much,

you dispose of it in this way: pay yourself 200*l.*;" it being the fact that Mr. Cook and the prisoner had before raised the sum, I think of 600*l.*; 200*l.* had been raised by Mr. Cook on his acceptance, and 400*l.* had been raised on the acceptance of the prisoner. Mr. Cook's portion had been paid off, but that of the prisoner remained unpaid. Palmer says to Mr. Herring, "Pay yourself 200*l.* then go to Pratt's and pay him 450*l.*; then go to Padwick and pay him 350*l.*." Now, it is perfectly clear that the 450*l.* was a debt due from Palmer to Pratt, and it is untrue that Cook had anything to do with it. The debt of 350*l.* to Padwick was for some bet, and although it is not proved, I have reason to believe that the minor part of it was a debt of Cook's, but the larger part was a debt of Palmer's upon a matter in which they stood in together. There is evidence that Mr. Palmer treated the debt due to Padwick as his. He says, "I will pay you my bet of 350*l.* at such a time." I am giving him credit for what I believe was the fact, that a part of it was Cook's. Why was Cook's debt paid then? There was a warrant-of-attorney in the hands of Mr. Padwick, and Mr. Padwick was getting impatient for his 1000*l.*, and if this debt had not been paid to Mr. Padwick, Mr. Padwick would have resented the non-payment of the debt of honour, which he had no means of enforcing, and would have come down upon Mr. Palmer, no doubt, at a very early period, in respect of the 1000*l.* due upon the bill dishonoured twelve months before. Exactly that came to pass: in consequence of Mr. Herring not receiving the

whole of the money, he was not able to pay Mr. Padwick, and the result was that Mr. Padwick put the process of the law in motion against the prisoner on that bill, and brought an action against his mother. The bill for 1000*l.* was the bill of Mr. Palmer, upon which Mr. Cook was not primarily liable. I say here was a distinct interest which the prisoner had to appropriate this money to himself, because it was the means for the moment, and the only means he could resort to, of staving off the evil hour which was rapidly approaching. The degree of difficulty in which he was placed must not be measured simply by the amount of his pecuniary liabilities. It was not merely that he had these large bills upon which at any moment process might be issued, but he had made his mother answerable for those bills, and the moment the first of them was put in motion in the Courts the fraud and forgery would come to light, and he would be exposed, not merely to the consequences of his inability to pay his debts but to the consequences of the law which he had violated. The former might have been got rid of; in the Insolvent Court or the Bankruptcy Court, but the crime of forgery could not have been got rid of, for that he would have to answer at the bar of a court of criminal justice, and would have incurred the penalty of transportation, or of penal servitude in an aggravated form. But there is a further sum besides the 1000*l.*; he appropriated a further sum of 350*l.*, which was to be got from Messrs. Wetherby's. It is said that he got a genuine cheque from Cook to entitle him to receive that money, but it is not for a moment suggested what induced Cook to give

it to him. Was it a genuine cheque? That matter might have been solved by its production; it is not produced; yet it is quite clear that it was returned to the prisoner's hands by Messrs. Wetherby when they could not get the money. It is quite clear that it was of great importance to him to get the money, because there was 100*l.* to be paid to Pratt, which must be paid in order to stave off the evil day upon the bill of 1500*l.* which was due on the 9th of November. Where is that cheque? If it had been produced we could have seen whether it was a genuine cheque or not. It is not forthcoming. What are the circumstances under which he presents that cheque to Mr. Cheshire? He goes to Mr. Cheshire upon the Tuesday, and, having shown the cheque to Mr. Cheshire, he asks Mr. Cheshire to be so good as to fill up the body of it. I suppose he saw some manifestation of surprise in Mr. Cheshire, and he said, "Cook, poor fellow, is ill, and I am apprehensive if I fill up the body of the cheque Wetherbys will know my handwriting." Why should not they know his handwriting? What objection was there, if the cheque was genuine, and if the transaction was an honest one, to Messrs. Wetherby's knowing that the handwriting was his? Does not it pretty plainly indicate that there was some fraud going on which he was afraid might be detected? Why, in Heaven's name, should he send for Cheshire? He had to send for Cheshire from the post-office when Cheshire was busily engaged in the business of the evening, at 7 o'clock in the evening. Just about that same period, a little before or a little after, as the case may be, he had to meet

Dr. Bamford and Mr. Jones in consultation as to Cook's case. Mr. Jones was his intimate friend, the trusty friend that came over that afternoon. If poor Cook intended to give him the cheque, and was at the same time so ill that he could not write, why not have said to Mr. Jones, "Jones, I do not want to bother Cook to fill up this cheque, fill it up in my favour for 350*l.*, and we will get Cook to sign it." Why should he send to the post-office to get Cheshire down to his house, alleging, at the time, that he was apprehensive that if he filled it up his own handwriting might be known. Does not that transaction bear fraud upon the face of it? On the other hand, it may be a genuine cheque; but, I ask again, where is it? Between the time when these matters were called in question and the time when Mr. Palmer was finally arrested, not upon the criminal but upon the civil process, which came down, unluckily for him, before the coroner's inquest, which secured his bodily presence to answer not only the pecuniary matters but these charges; in the interval he had undisturbed possession of his own papers. From the moment when that freedom of action and possession ceased, we have traced the possession of the papers; and it is clear that at the time those papers were taken possession of that cheque was not amongst them; it is clear that the prisoner, who had possession of it, must have dealt with it in some manner. What has become of it? Why is it not produced? Can you help drawing the inference from its non-production, that there is something in the transaction which will not bear the light? It is clear that he intended to get possession of the 350*l.* which

ought to have been given to Cook, upon false pretences. He had not a farthing himself, for when he went to Shrewsbury races he borrowed 25*l.* As I have shown, a person made a bet for him upon the races, and, having won 200*l.*, pressed him for the debt, but could not get another shilling from him. I show you that he comes back to Rugeley, and is from that moment in the possession of money. Where could he have got that money? It is clear that he must have got it from Cook, who had not any left himself; it is clear that he had all that money to the extent of 350*l.*, probably much more, and besides that he gets 1200*l.* as the proceeds of the betting at Tattersall's, and he attempts to get, but does not get, 375*l.*, which ought to have been paid into Messrs. Wetherby's hands. This was the whole of the worldly possessions, the whole sum of the wealth of this poor young man.

But he is not satisfied with that—it is clear that he meditated another fraud of a different description. On the Friday, almost as soon as the breath is out of the man's body, he intimates that he has a claim upon him for 3000*l.* or 4000*l.* in respect of bills which had his (Palmer's) name or acceptance upon them, but which in fact had been negotiated for Cook's purposes. He tells the same story to the father-in-law, but it is as clear as the sun at noon-day that he endeavoured to fabricate an instrument to give a show of colour to those representations. He goes on the Thursday or the Friday to Mr. Cheshire, and brings to him a document which he asks him to attest, that document bearing the signature "J. P. Cook." The man having left the body and living only in the spirit, eighth

and-forty hours before that signature had been brought to be attested, who can fail to see that here was some great fraud and design meditated? What was the document? It was a document which purported to be an acknowledgment from Cook that certain large bills which had been negotiated were for Cook's benefit, and for Cook's benefit alone, and that he (Palmer) had had no part of the proceeds. Now there are no such bills in existence. We have exhausted the bills pretty well, I think, and none such are proved to exist; but if there be any such bills in existence, who would know it better than the prisoner at the bar? he could have no difficulty in satisfying you of the fact, and of removing this great stumbling-block in the way of his defence; but he produces this document; and on the same day, the day that followed this poor man's death, he writes to Pratt, and says, "Mind, I must have Polestar, if it can be arranged." What was this scheme? Having got every shilling of the man's money, his purpose was to secure the little property that remained in Polestar, the value of which he may perhaps to himself have considerably exaggerated. The mare had just won, and she might be supposed to be worth more than she had been, or he had in view speculating at other races to bring about results of benefit to himself. Further, he may have intended to pay out of Cook's estate some of those bills, under the pretence that Cook had had the money for them. For all these purposes, from the beginning to the end, it was necessary that Cook should be put on one side. Then with this document in his hand he goes to Cheshire, and he asks Cheshire

to attest the signature of a man who was then dead. If Cheshire had had the weakness and wickedness to comply, he would have had him in his power; and the next thing would have been, that he would have brought him trembling and reluctant into the witness-box of some court of justice to swear to the fact that he had seen the dead man put his signature to that piece of paper. But it may be suggested, that after all the document was a genuine one, and that the signature was not a forgery. Then produce it, and we can judge. Here again I point out, and there is no escape from it, that the papers of the prisoner were in his possession till the time of his arrest, and they have been taken care of since then, and are here, one and all, either to be answered for or produced in this presence, or they have been handed over to his brother. Who would not fail to notice that this paper has never been found or asked for? Who can doubt that that paper brought to Cheshire remained in the possession of the prisoner? Who can doubt that it is either destroyed or is purposely withheld? Under these circumstances, who can doubt that in it is to be found proof of some meditated act, of some vast design of a fraudulent and flagitious character, for the full completion of which the death of Cook was a necessary thing?

Now, gentlemen, I have gone through that part of the case which relates to the motives of the prisoner, and it will be for you to say whether you are satisfied that this was a death by strychnia—that the prisoner was in possession of strychnia—that he had access to the dead man's bedside, and that he administered pills to him at a period

short enough to be capable of being connected with the catastrophe that afterwards happened; and it will be for you to say whether you do not find that the state of things with reference to pecuniary matters, to which I have been just alluding, is sufficient to account for the act which is ascribed to the prisoner.

But there is another part of his conduct, as throwing light upon this matter, to which I cannot fail to refer. What has become of Cook's betting-book? What has been the conduct and the language of the prisoner with reference to it? On the night when Cook died, ere the breath had hardly passed from that poor man's body, the prisoner at the bar was rummaging his pockets and searching under his pillow. That may have been for a perfectly legitimate purpose. But let us see what takes place. He calls to Mr. Jones and he tells Mr. Jones that it is his duty, as the nearest friend of the dead man, to take possession of his effects, and Mr. Jones does take possession of his watch, and afterwards, at the suggestion of the prisoner, of his rings. At the same time, Mr. Jones asks for the betting-book. My learned friend endeavoured to explain away this most awkward part of the case, by saying, "There were other persons who had access to the place. The undertaker came there with his men, the women came to lay out the dead body, and the servants were there; any one of those might have stolen the book." But all this is met by the fact that, on that same night, before the women had had anything to do in the room—before they came to lay out the corpse—before anybody made their appearance—that very night, when Mr. Jones is

seeking to gather up the effects of the dead man, he asks for the book. What is the answer? "Oh," says Palmer, adopting the language which he afterwards repeated, "the betting-book will be of no use to any one." Does anybody doubt in his own mind where that betting-book had gone to? The father-in-law came down on the Friday, and he begins to discourse about the affair, and he is not satisfied with the answers he gets. The day passes away. He says to Mr. Jones, "Be so good as to collect my son-in-law's betting-book and papers and bring them away." Mr. Jones goes up stairs; he is immediately followed by the prisoner: up they go, but there is no betting-book to be found. Down comes Mr. Jones and says to Mr. Stephens, "We cannot find the betting-book." "Not find the betting-book! surely you must be mistaken:" and, turning round, he says, "Why, Mr. Palmer, how is this?" Upon which Mr. Palmer says, "Oh, the betting-book is of no use." "No use! I am the best judge of that. I think it will be of a good deal of use." The observation is again repeated, "It is of no use." Mr. Stephens said, "Why?" "Because a dead man's bets are void, and because he received the money himself upon the course at Shrewsbury." A dead man's bets are void! Yes, that is true; they are void, but not when they have been received in his lifetime. Who received the dead man's bets? The prisoner at the bar. Who appropriated the proceeds of the dead man's bets? The prisoner at the bar. Who was answerable for them? The prisoner at the bar. Who had an interest in concealing the fact that he had received them? He had. What was the best mode of doing it? The destruction of

the betting-book. What was the best mode of calming the determination of the man who was the executor of the dead man, when he wanted to know what he was entitled to receive and what he had received, and to see the record of his pecuniary transactions? Why, to tell him that the record, even if found, would be of no use, for a dead man was not entitled to any bets, he having died before they were received: yet at that very moment he had received the proceeds of the bets which he was representing as void, and was applying the proceeds to his own purpose. Does not that throw light upon the real nature of the transaction? What possible motive could he have for representing that the bets were void, having himself received them, unless he knew that he had received them fraudulently and wrongfully? See what would have taken place if the truth had come out. Mr. Stephens, if he had seen that book, would have seen that his step-son was entitled to receive 1,020*l*. He would have inquired who was his agent, to see whether by possibility those debts could be realised; he would have learned what everybody knew, at least that portion of the turfites with whom Cook was in the habit of communicating, that Fisher was his agent. Fisher would have told him, "I ought to have received the money to repay myself 200*l*., but Mr. Herring received the money." He would have gone to Mr. Herring, and he would have found that every shilling of the money found its way into the prisoner's pocket, and was appropriated to his own purposes. How was all this to be done? By the removal of Cook, and then by the destruction of the only record which could have af-

forded to his representative, who was entitled to stand in his place and realise his pecuniary rights, the information of the money having been received by a wrong-doer, by a man who had no right to it. Gentlemen, I submit these things to your consideration, but I submit them to you as leading unhappily but to one conclusion, and that the conclusion of the prisoner's guilt.

But, gentlemen, the matter does not even rest here; there is more of the prisoner's conduct yet to be commented upon, on which I must say a few words before I conclude: Mr. Stephens determined upon having a *post-mortem* examination. Let us watch the conduct of the prisoner in respect of that most important part of the history of this case. Dr. Harland comes over to perform this most important office; the prisoner is on the watch to see who comes; he meets him as he alights at the inn; he accompanies him to Dr. Bamford's; they get into conversation about this death, and Dr. Harland says, naturally enough, speaking to a brother medical man whom he supposed had been attendant upon the patient, "What is this case? I hear there is a suspicion of poisoning." "Oh no," says Palmer, "not at all; no suspicion of poisoning; the man had two epileptic fits upon the Monday and Tuesday, and you will find old disease, both of the head, and of the heart." Well, there was no disease found of the head nor of the heart, unless that very wise gentleman, whom I should have liked to have asked a few questions of to-day, was right about his story of angina pectoris, which I doubt was ever accompanied by tetanic symptoms in this world, or that any other man in the universe

would declare that it was. "You will find disease of the head and the heart." They opened him, and found neither. He said, "He had two epileptic fits on the Monday and Tuesday." That very same man the day before had gone to Dr. Bamford, and asked Dr. Bamford to fill up the certificate, and Dr. Bamford said, naturally enough, "He is your patient, not mine, I have only attended him at your request." "No, I would rather you did." He gets Dr. Bamford to fill in "apoplexy;" the next day he tells Dr. Harland that it is a case of epilepsy. This is not an ordinary individual, but a medical man, possessing full knowledge and information with regard to medical matters: however, the *post-mortem* examination took place: before they go to it there is some conversation with Newton which I will not again more particularly refer to: it is not satisfactory, nor does it show the state of mind in which you would expect to find a man whose friend had just died from the way in which he speaks of the examination about to take place. Let us come to the examination itself. The stomach and its contents are, as we understood, removed; there is some story about his having pushed against the parties who were performing the examination; I think that is carrying the matter too far; it may have been an accident, and we will look at it in that light; at last the stomach, we say without its contents, and a portion of the intestines, are put into a jar, and the jar is fastened with a parchment covering doubled over it; it is tied and sealed, and then it is placed upon a table while the *post-mortem* examination, with reference to other parts of the body, is made.

Dr. Harland has this done; when Dr. Harland turns round, he finds the jar removed: he immediately makes an outcry, and then at the other end of a long room, and at a door which was not the proper entrance, but a door which led into a different apartment, which apartment led into the passage, the prisoner was found with the jar in his hand, and when Dr. Harland exclaims, he says, "I thought it would have been more convenient to you when you were going out." That might have been his motive, though it was an awkward circumstance that the jar containing the stomach should be in the hands of the man against whom there rested a suspicion of having deprived the deceased of life by unfair means. That is not all; two slits were found in the parchment cover when it was tied and sealed up; who could have made them except the prisoner? What did he do it for? There again we are lost in conjecture, but the only conclusion at which we can arrive is against the honesty of the purpose and the integrity of the transaction; whether it may have been for the purpose of introducing something which might be capable of neutralising the poison, I cannot tell you; all I know is the fact, and it is a fact of very significant importance in the consideration of the case.

It does not end there: we find that he is restless and uneasy as to what is going to be done with the jar, and objects to its being taken away; he remonstrates with Dr. Bamford at letting it go away, as if Dr. Bamford had any interest in the matter, and as if any one would suspect Dr. Bamford of having had any hand in the taking off of this poor man. The jar is taken away, and then that occurred which

must have made a painful impression upon all who heard it in this court—there comes the story of his going to the postboy, and asking him to upset the carriage which was conveying those who had possession of the jar to Stafford or London, for the purpose of its contents being analysed. My learned friend sought to give a comparatively innocent complexion to this transaction; he says that this bribe of 10*l.* to upset the carriage arose simply out of resentment against the officious stepfather who had dared to interfere in this matter—to insist upon a searching investigation: he had been guilty, my learned friend says, in return for the civility, courtesy, and kindness with which he had been treated by the prisoner, of “prying, meddling, insolent curiosity.” A man who had seen his poor step-son, to whom he was tenderly attached, lying dead under circumstances which raised in his mind a suspicion—and I think I am fully justified, at all events, whatever may be the result of this inquiry, in saying that the very inquiry we are now upon—the gravity and importance of it—at least fully justify Mr. Stephens in the suspicions which he entertained for having insisted upon the inquiry, and that ought to have protected him against the suggestion of “insolent curiosity.” It was known that Mr. Stephens insisted upon inquiry: was it a reasonable motive operating upon this man’s mind that it should occasion such a sense of resentment and anger that he should desire the destruction or mutilation of this man, and offer 10*l.* to the postboy to upset him upon the road? I believe the other to have been the true version—if you upset him you may break the jar, and then the con-

tents never could be found, and there would be no danger of strychnia being discovered.

But it does not stop even there; the inquiry takes place, and the *post-mortem* examination having been made, a Coroner’s inquest is insisted upon and becomes inevitable, and then we have the prisoner seeking to tamper with the administration of a most important office; sending presents to the Coroner at the time the inquest was sitting; presents, unquestionably, of game and things of that description, and if the evidence does not very much mislead us a present of money also; for what purpose was all that done? We find him with uneasy restlessness, obtaining through Cheshire information of what is taking place between the professional man who was employed to analyse the contents of the stomach, and the attorney at Rugeley, who was instructed on behalf of Mr. Stephens; is that the conduct of innocence or guilt? why should he be desirous of knowing whether strychnia above all other things should be found in the intestines of the deceased? Let me call your attention to the letter which he writes to the Coroner, “I am sorry to tell you that I am still confined to my bed; I do not think it was mentioned at the inquest yesterday that Cook was taken ill on Sunday, and on Monday night in the same way that he was on Tuesday night when he died; the chambermaid at the Crown Hotel can prove this; I believe a man of the name of Fisher is coming down to prove that he received some money at Shrewsbury; now, here he can only pay Smith 10*l.* out of 41*l.* he owed him.” Does he tell what had become of the rest of the money

that the man had at Shrewsbury? "Had you not better call Smith," that is Mr. Jeremiah Smith whom we saw here to-day, "to prove this." What a witness Jeremiah Smith would have been in the hands of the Coroner, Mr. Ward, the friendly Coroner of Staffordshire! "And again, whatever Professor Taylor may say to-morrow, he wrote from London last Tuesday night to Gardiner to say, we (that is Dr. Taylor and Dr. Rees) have this day finished our analysis, and find no traces of either strychnia, prussic acid, or opium; what can beat this from a man like Taylor, if he says what he has already said of Dr. Harland's evidence; mind you, I know it, I saw in black and white what Taylor said to Gardiner; but this is strictly private and confidential, but it is true. As regards his betting book, I know nothing of it, and it is of no good to any one;" the repetition of the same story; "I hope the verdict to-morrow will be that he died of natural causes, and thus end it;" but the verdict was not so, and it did not end it; and it is for you to say whether upon a review of the whole of this evidence you can come to any other conclusion than that of the prisoner's guilt. Look at his restless anxiety; it may possibly, it is true, be compatible with innocence, but I think on the other hand it must be admitted that it bears strongly the aspect of guilt; if it stood alone, I would not ask you upon that to come to a conclusion adverse to the prisoner, but it is one of a series of things small perhaps each individually in themselves, but taken as a whole, as I submit to you, leading irresistibly to the conclusion of the guilt of this man.

Now, gentlemen, the whole case is before you. It will be for you to determine it. You have, on the one hand, a man overwhelmed by a pressure almost unparalleled and unexampled, of pecuniary liabilities, which he is utterly unable to meet, involving the penalties of the law, which must bring disaster and ruin upon him. His only mode of averting those consequences is by obtaining money; and, under those circumstances, with a bad man, a small amount, if that amount will meet the exigencies of the moment and avert the impending catastrophe and ruin, will operate with immense power. Then you find that he has access to the bedside of the man whose death we are now inquiring into; that he has the means of administering poison to him, and you find that within eight-and-forty hours, he has twice acquired possession of the very poison, the traces of which are found in the death, and after the death; and then you have the death itself in its terrible and revolting circumstances, all of which are characteristic only of death by that poison and of no other. You have then the fact, that, to the uttermost of his ability, he realises the purpose for which it is suggested to you the death was accomplished. You have all those facts, and the undoubted and undisputed fact, that a subsidiary poison was also used, of which traces have been found in the man's body, although no traces may have been found, for the reasons and from the causes I have suggested, of the principal poison, whose possession by the prisoner we have traced, and whose presence we show in the symptoms which accompanied the death of the deceased. It is for you to take all

those circumstances into your consideration.

Gentlemen, you have indeed had introduced into this case one other element which I own I think would have been better omitted. You have had from my learned friend the unusual, and I think I may say unprecedented, assurance of his conviction of his client's innocence.

Mr. Serjeant Shee.—Not unprecedented.

The Attorney General.—I can only say I think it would have been better if my learned friend had abstained from so strange a declaration. What would he think of me if, imitating his example, I at this moment stated to you, upon my "honour," as he did, what is my internal conviction from a conscientious consideration of this case? The best reproof which I can administer to my learned friend is to abstain from imitating so dangerous an example. My learned friend in that address, of which we all admired the power and ability, also adopted a course sometimes resorted to by advocates, but which I cannot help thinking is more or less an insult to a jury, the endeavouring to intimidate them by the fear of their own consciences and the fear of the country's opinion from discharging firmly and honestly the great and solemn duty which you have to perform upon this occasion. My learned friend told you if your verdict should be Guilty, one day or other the innocence of the prisoner would be made manifest, and you would never cease to repent the verdict you had given. If my learned friend was sincere in that—and I know he was—there is no man in whom the spirit of truth

and honour is more keenly alive—he said what he believed: but all I can say in answer is, that it shows how when a man enters with a bias upon his mind upon the consideration of a subject he is led into error; and when my learned friend said that he had entered upon this case with an unbiassed and an unprejudiced mind, who could have failed to feel that never in anything could he have been more deceived than in thinking that? For who that has to give his best energies to a defence upon such a charge as this would not shrink in his own mind from the conclusion that he was to advocate the cause of one who he believed to have been guilty of the foulest of all imaginable crimes? I say, therefore, I think my learned friend had better have abstained from making any observations which involved the assurance of his own conviction. I say further, I think he ought in justice and in consideration of you to have abstained from reminding you or telling you that the voice of the country would not sanction the verdict which you were about to give. I say nothing of the inconsistency which is involved in such a statement, coming from one who but a short hour before had complained in eloquent terms of the universal torrent of passion and prejudice by which he said his client was oppressed and borne down. Why, gentlemen, in answer to my learned friend, I have only to say, pay no regard to the voice of the country, whether it be for condemnation or acquittal; pay no regard to anything but the internal voice of your own consciences, and the sense of that duty to God and man which you are to discharge upon this occasion. Seek no re-

ward except the comforting assurance when you shall look back to the events of this day, that you have discharged to the best of your ability and to the uttermost of your power the duty that it was yours to perform. If, upon a review of this whole case, comparing the evidence upon the one side and upon the other, and weighing it in the even scales of justice, you can come to a conclusion of the prisoner's innocence, or even entertain that fair and reasonable amount of doubt of which the accused is entitled to the benefit, in God's name acquit him. But if, on the other hand, all the facts and all the evidence lead your minds, with satisfaction to yourselves, to the conclusion of the prisoner's guilt, then, but then only, I ask for a verdict of guilty at your hands. For the protection of the good, and for the repression of the wicked, I ask for that verdict, by which alone, as it seems to me, the safety of society can be secured, and the demands, the imperious demands, of public justice can alone be satisfied.

On the eleventh day of this protracted trial, the Lord Chief Justice commenced his charge to the jury, which occupied the whole of this day and half the next. His Lordship said that the allegations on the part of the Crown were, that John Parsons Cook was first tampered with by antimony; that he was then killed by strychnia; and that his symptoms were the symptoms of poisoning by strychnia. It was then alleged that the prisoner had a motive for making away with him; that he had an opportunity of administering the poison; and that on two days, when the poison was supposed to have been administered, he actually purchased strychnia, the poison employed;

and that, as they allege, his conduct before that transaction, before the deed, while it was going on, and afterwards, was that of a guilty and not of an innocent man. On the other side it was contended (and the jury were to say whether or not truly contended) that the prisoner at the bar was really the victim of prejudice; that he had no interest in the death of the deceased; and, on the contrary, that the death of the deceased was to his prejudice: further, that Cook did not die from poison by strychnia, but from natural disease; that his symptoms were those of natural disease, and not of poison by strychnia; and further, it was contended, that no part of the evidence which had been given showed anything which was at all consistent with the guilt of the prisoner. It was for the jury to determine between the allegations on the one side and the other, according to the evidence. The burthen of proving the guilt rested on the prosecution, and unless that is fully sustained, and they were convinced upon the evidence that he was guilty, then it would be their duty to acquit the prisoner. But in a case of this kind, they could not expect that witnesses should be called to state that they saw the deadly poison administered by the prisoner, or mixed up by the prisoner openly before them. Circumstantial evidence as to that was all that could be reasonably expected; and if there were a series of circumstances leading to the conclusion of guilt, then a verdict of Guilty might satisfactorily be pronounced. With respect to the alleged motive, it was of great importance to see whether there was a motive for committing such a crime, or whether

there was not, or whether there was an improbability of its having been committed so strong as not to be overpowered by positive evidence. But if there was any motive which could be assigned, he was bound to tell them that the adequacy of that motive was of little importance. They knew from the experience of criminal courts, that atrocious crimes of this sort had been committed from very slight motives; not merely from malice and revenge, but to gain a small pecuniary advantage, and to drive off for a time pressing difficulties. The jury would have to consider well whether the symptoms of Cook's death were consistent with a poisoning by strychnia. If they were not, if they believed that death arose from natural causes, the prisoner was at once entitled to a verdict of Not Guilty at their hands; but if those symptoms were consistent with a poisoning by strychnia, then they would have another and an important question to consider, whether the evidence which had been adduced was sufficient to convince them that it was a death by strychnia, and by strychnia which the prisoner administered. In cases of this sort, the evidence had often been divided into medical and moral evidence; the medical being that of the scientific men, and the moral the circumstantial facts which were calculated to prove the truth of the charge against the party accused. They could not be finally separated in the minds of the jury, because it was by combination of the two species of evidence that their verdict ought to be found. In this case they would look at the medical evidence, to see whether the deceased, in their opinion, did die by

strychnia or by natural disease; and they would look at what was called the moral evidence, and consider whether that showed that the prisoner not only had the opportunity, but that he actually availed himself of that opportunity, to administer to the deceased the deadly poison of which he died.

The Lord Chief Justice then proceeded to read from his notes the evidence of the witnesses, pointing out those portions which were most material, and those on which the jury were to exercise the judgment reposed in them.

Soon after 2 p.m. of the twelfth day the Lord Chief Justice concluded his address in these words:—Gentlemen, the case is now in your hands; and, unless upon the part of the prosecution a clear conviction has been brought to your minds of the guilt of the prisoner, it is your duty to acquit him. You are not to proceed even upon a strong suspicion; there must be the strongest conviction in your minds that he was guilty of this offence; and if there be any reasonable doubt remaining in your mind, you will give him the benefit of that doubt; but if you come to a clear conviction that he was guilty, you will not be deterred from doing your duty by any considerations such as have been suggested to you. You will remember the oath that you have taken, and you will act accordingly. Gentlemen, I have performed my task; you have now to discharge yours, and may God direct you to a right finding.

The jury retired at 18 minutes past 2 p.m., and returned into Court at 24 minutes to 4 p.m. They pronounced the prisoner *Guilty*.

As the jury entered and were about to deliver their verdict, it was observed that the prisoner

looked pale and his countenance exhibited some show of anxiety; but he almost instantly recovered his self-possession; and he heard the verdict delivered with perfect calmness and firmness. This is perhaps the more surprising because throughout the trial, and even to the eve of his execution, he clung to the hope of life with surprising tenacity. Even at the close of the Lord Chief Justice's summing up, which was felt to be adverse, the prisoner retained his confidence, and is said to have thrown over to his counsel a paper on which he had written "I think there will be a verdict of Not Guilty."

The Lord Chief Justice passed sentence of death in the following terms:—William Palmer, after a long and impartial trial you have been convicted by a jury of your country of the crime of wilful murder. In that verdict my two learned brothers, who have so anxiously watched this trial, and myself entirely concur, and consider that verdict altogether satisfactory. The case is attended with such circumstances of aggravation that I do not dare to touch upon them. Whether it is the first and only offence of this sort which you have committed is certainly known only to God and your own conscience. It is seldom that such a familiarity with the means of death should be shown without long experience; but for this offence of which you have been found guilty your life is forfeited. You must prepare to die; and I trust that, as you can expect no mercy in this world, you will, by repentance of your crimes, seek to obtain mercy from Almighty God. The Act of Parliament under which you have been tried, and under which you have been brought

to the bar of this Court at your own request, gives leave to the Court to direct that the sentence under such circumstances shall be executed either within the jurisdiction of the Central Criminal Court or in the county where the offence was committed. We think that, for the sake of example, the sentence ought to be executed in the county of Stafford. Now, I hope that this terrible example will deter others from committing such atrocious crimes, and that it will be seen that whatever art, or caution, or experience may accomplish, such an offence will be detected and punished. However destructive poisons may be, it is so ordained by Providence that there are means for the safety of His creatures, for detecting and punishing those who administer them. I again implore you to repent and prepare for the awful change which awaits you. I will not seek to harrow up your feelings by any enumeration of the circumstances of this foul murder. I will content myself now with passing upon you the sentence of the law, which is, that you be taken hence to the gaol of Newgate, and thence removed to the gaol of the county of Stafford, being the county in which the offence of which you are justly convicted was committed; and that you be taken thence to a place of execution, and be there hanged by the neck until you are dead; and that your body be afterwards buried within the precincts of the prison in which you shall be last confined after your conviction; and may the Lord have mercy upon your soul. Amen!

The same evening Palmer was conveyed to the gaol of Stafford, there to await the day of earthly retribution.

The conduct of this terrible criminal, from the commencement of his trial to the moment when it was announced to him that his fate was certain, would afford an interesting subject of study; but the authorities of the gaol were very careful not to permit his actions to be subject of vulgar curiosity. He appears to have fully convinced himself that the non-detection of strychnia in Cook's body was fatal to the case of the prosecution, and that the jury *could not* find him Guilty in the absence of that proof. After the verdict had been pronounced he still clung to the belief, with a desperate tenacity, that the Government would not direct the sentence to be carried out. In this delusion he was supported by the efforts of his friends to obtain a respite from the Home Secretary, on the grounds of some alleged information as to the witnesses Newton and Mills, the non-detection of strychnia, and alleged misdirection in the Lord Chief Justice's charge. The wretched man acted a part in conformity with this idea. Aware that the slightest admission of guilt would seal his fate, he systematically played the part of a man improperly convicted; performed his religious duties with decency, and professed himself penitent for many sins; but to any exhortation to admit the justice of his sentence, he showed a studied indifference. Saturday, the 14th of June, had been appointed for his execution; but even when, on the evening of the 13th, the High Sheriff announced to him that there was no possibility of a reprieve, and prayed him to prepare for death, it was evident that, although struck silent, he did not abandon hope of life. Under this miserable conflict

of hopes and fears the wretched man frittered away those moments which should have been spent in repentant prayer at the throne of grace. It is true that he joined in the ministrations of religion with fervour, and received the exhortations of the chaplain with gratitude; but these better feelings (never agonized) were alternated with suggestions that strychnia had not been found, and complaints of the unfairness of Lord Campbell's charge. Occasionally his eyes were suffused with tears, but he immediately wiped them away and regained his composure.

On the morning of the 14th the gaol was surrounded by thousands of eager spectators, many of whom had taken up their stations the preceding evening, and had patiently endured the discomforts of a dark and rainy night. The wretched man had slept his last sleep quietly, and when in the morning the chaplain entered his cell he declared himself comfortable and quite prepared. When, soon after seven o'clock, he was solemnly asked by the High Sheriff whether he was prepared to acknowledge the justice of his sentence, he replied with energy, "No, sir, I do not; I go to the scaffold a murdered man." When the preliminary duties of the hangman had been performed, and the convict was about to quit the cell for the scaffold, the chaplain exhorted him, in the most solemn manner, to admit the justice of his sentence; but he replied firmly that it was not a just sentence. He moved forward to the scaffold with a light step, and nothing but the pallor of his face showed any undercurrent of feeling. He died apparently instantaneously. The corpse of the murderer is said to have been

stripped of every article of clothing, and buried without even a shell within the prison. Such is said to be the practice of Stafford Gaol. In this instance the indignity strikes awe; but it is a barbarous custom, and should be discontinued.

It was natural that the public should desire to know as much as possible of the last moments of a criminal whose deeds had cast a shadow over the length and breadth of the land; and although the justice of the verdict was universally admitted, a morbid desire was exhibited to ascertain whether the murderer had admitted his guilt. The reserve of the prison authorities prevented much being known; but the brief account above given is derived from the limited information imparted by the governor of the gaol to the daily journals. The chaplain to the gaol, the Rev. Mr. Goodacre, presented his report of his visits to the convict to the magistrates. The document has not, it is believed, been made public. It is in the form of a diary, and is reported to contain much curious matter. The most interesting notice which has transpired is, that when Palmer became finally convinced that he had nothing to hope, and in his temporary submission to the exhortations of the chaplain, he evidently resorted to a series of mental reservations—that “strychnia had not been found in Cook’s body;” that “he did not poison Cook *by strychnia*.” When exhorted to confess for his soul’s sake, he is reported to have said, “If it is necessary for my soul’s sake to confess this murder, I ought also to confess the others; I mean my wife and brother.” But when the chaplain asked him specifically whether he was guilty

of the murder of his wife, he made no reply, and the same silence followed the same question in reference to his brother.

Casts of Palmer’s head were taken after his execution. Mr. Bally, a phrenologist of Manchester, thus describes his organization:—“The posterior region (corresponding with the posterior lobe of the brain) is very broad and shallow. Amativeness is very large, as is also combativeness; but philoprogenitiveness is small—not comparatively only, but actually. The middle region is very large. Here secretiveness is remarkably prominent, as well as alimentativeness; destructiveness, acquisitiveness, and constructiveness being large. Love of life is moderate. Coming to the anterior region, the perceptive faculties are large; but the region of those of reflection is narrow and retreating. The organs of the moral sentiments are singularly developed, and partake of the form of an egg. Benevolence is full, and hope rather large; veneration being a degree less prominent, and conscientiousness very small.”

THE LEEDS POISONING CASE.

(*Tried at York on July 16, 17, 18, and 19, before Mr. Baron Bramwell.*)

Many causes concurred to give what was called “The Leeds Poisoning Case” considerable interest. It was an instance of poisoning by strychnia, to which Palmer’s trial had given such fearful notoriety; the deed, following the singular law of imitation which has been observed to result from great crimes, had been suggested by the revelations in that case; while by

a remarkable retribution the phenomena attending the death of the victim had been carefully noted and had formed an important part of the moral evidence by which the fact that Cook's death had been caused by strychnia had been established. It was besides rumoured that there were incidents to this murder which belonged rather to the dark ages than to these days of reading and intelligence. Owing to these circumstances the trial was conducted with a minuteness and length which did not otherwise belong to it; for there existed direct proof that the deceased had been poisoned by strychnia, and circumstantial evidence which placed it beyond doubt that that poison had been administered by her husband. The great length at which it has been judged desirable to give the trial of Palmer—for the crime was of the most atrocious character, and the proofs most elaborate—will not allow space even for an abstract of that of Dove, which extended over four days. Neither is it necessary, for the discovery of strychnia in large quantity in the body of Mrs. Dove, and the conclusive evidence that the prisoner was the murderer, reduced the case to matter of ordinary proof. It will therefore suffice to give a short narrative of facts, with such incidents as are of peculiar interest, and then to refer to the singular confession of the murderer.

The accused, who was a young man of about thirty, respectably dressed, and with an intelligent look, was the son of a leather manufacturer of Leeds, who died in 1854, leaving his son an annuity of 90*l.* a year. The prisoner had been brought up a farmer, and held a small farm at Bramham when

he married the deceased in 1852. He quitted this farm in the beginning of 1855—owing to his drunken habits—and was living on the annuity in the Kirkstall Road, at Leeds, at the time of these occurrences. The prisoner, it would appear by the evidence, had from his childhood exhibited peculiarities of intellect. Whether these indicated unsoundness of mind was the question debated between the counsel for the Crown and the prisoner's advocates. Witnesses stated many acts which in their opinion indicated insanity; to others they appeared to indicate a brutal selfish disposition—a hardened cruelty, delighting to inflict pain and do mischief without cause, and even without pleasure—such as burning out cats' eyes with vitriol, hoisting a cow's leg over a beam, tying cows together by the tails and sprinkling them with vitriol, setting fire to fences, chasing his sisters with a red-hot poker. As he grew older his mischievous propensities extended as his power increased. He was fond of pointing guns and pistols at persons, and firing at their doors and windows; shooting domesticated cats in the most wanton manner,—in short, he clearly exhibited what one of his advocates called “an uncontrollable propensity to destroy life and give pain.” This ferocious disposition was aggravated by habitual drunkenness, which, while it stimulated his passions, stupified him as to the consequences to himself. With these brutal propensities, it may be readily supposed that his wife led a most wretched life. Instinctively aware of the impunity which the nature of marriage secures to the ill-doer save in the last extremity, the cowardly sa-

vage kept his miserable partner in continual terror. Once it was arranged that they should separate; but unfortunately, by the interference of injudicious friends, the arrangement was broken. About the beginning of 1856, the desire of getting rid of his wife appears to have possessed him—whether originating from hatred, or cruelty, or through the evil suggestions of another, cannot be known. In January, the inquiries into the poisoning of Mr. Cook, at Rugeley, and particularly the evidence of the chemical analysts, as to the action of antimony and strychnia, filled the newspapers. The revelations thus made appear to have made a deep impression on Dove's brutal mind—he learnt that a poison existed which would inflict death with exquisite pain, and which might be administered without fear of detection, for that it could not be detected in a corpse—such, it is clear, was the conviction Dove derived from the discussions in Palmer's case. The brute appears to have been so elated with this knowledge that he was perpetually talking and asking questions about the effect of strychnia; the current of his ideas clearly being, that it could not be detected in a corpse. Whether the idea of destroying his wife by means of this poison had entered his mind, cannot be known—in his confession he says it had not:—but about this time he began to talk of his wife's bad health and of the certainty of her speedy death, and even of his intention to marry a certain other person after her decease. On the 24th January, a person named Harrison read to him an account of the inquest on Cook, and the statement that Dr. Taylor had

been unable to discover strychnia in Cook's body. He asked Harrison if he could make him some strychnia. Harrison refused, and Dove then said he could get some. This Harrison being “the Leeds wizard” afterwards referred to, it is important to compare the evidence with the confession—the result will probably be a conviction that the idea of taking off his wife by strychnia was fixed in Dove's mind. He now cast about to obtain some of the poison. He appears to have had access to the surgery of Mr. Morley, a very respectable practitioner in his neighbourhood. With this gentleman's assistants he had repeated conversations respecting strychnia, and, at length, on the 10th of February, obtained from one of them ten grains—a quantity sufficient to destroy fifteen or twenty persons. He said his house was infested with rats and mice, and that he wished to destroy them. The poison was laid in considerable quantities, and, to his great delight, several cats and mice were killed in great agony. About a week later, on the 17th of February, he obtained four or five grains more. What use was made of this second quantity the counsel for the Crown were unable to show.

A few days before his wife's first attack, on Wednesday or Thursday, the 19th or 20th of February, he was found by Mr. Morley's groom alone in the surgery; he had turned up the gas, and now turned it down, with an appearance of flurry. It was suggested by the Crown that he had helped himself to a further portion of strychnia. During all these transactions he was perpetually talking of the action of strychnia, of the impossibility of detecting its

presence after death, and evidently studied the evidence in Cook's case with great minuteness.

Mrs. Dove had not been quite well, but on Sunday, the 23rd of February, she had quite recovered. On the Monday, after breakfasting with her husband, she went up stairs to assist the servant in making the beds. While so engaged, she was suddenly taken ill; she staggered, became paralysed, started, "twitched," and jumped; the slightest touch, or an attempt to touch, touching the bed-clothes, and even walking across the room, renewed the convulsions. Mr. Dove was sent for, and then went for the doctor, to whom he represented that his wife had been ill all night; he asked also whether, if his wife should die, there would be a coroner's inquest? After two or three hours' sufferings the convulsions passed away, and the patient remained free from pain; the prisoner was very attentive, and administered the medicine with his own hands. On Wednesday the poor woman had another attack of precisely the same nature as before. The prisoner said to Mr. Morley, the doctor, that his wife would die. The unfortunate wife was seen to cry bitterly, and said she was sure it was the medicine that made her ill. On Thursday, at seven o'clock in the morning, there was another attack. On Friday morning, the prisoner in conversation said he thought his wife would have another attack at ten o'clock that night; he came home and administered a draught at ten o'clock, and in half-an-hour his wife had a very bad attack; she suffered greatly and exclaimed, "Oh, dear! I thought it was all over!" In all these cases, when

the spasms had passed away, the poor creature seemed to suffer from exhaustion only, and appeared otherwise quite well. The following day the prisoner went out, and returned much in liquor. At 8 P.M., at his wife's request, he gave her some medicine. She said, "It is very disagreeable; and very hot and very bitter." The prisoner immediately washed out the glass and wiped it, saying, "I always wash it out; medicine is such nasty stuff." At half-past eight, the poor creature was seized with another spasm; paroxysm succeeded paroxysm, and she died in the greatest agony at 20 minutes to 11. It is needless to recount the expressions and actions of the prisoner during his wife's sufferings, or his proceedings afterwards; they were marked by a stupid cunning which thwarted his own ends, and made circumstantial proof of his guilt.

Mr. Morley, on observing the symptoms of Mrs. Dove's illness, was struck by their resemblance to those produced by strychnia; and when, on hearing of Mrs. Dove's death, his assistant communicated to him the fact of the prisoner's having had possession of strychnia, he resolved on a *post-mortem* examination. This the prisoner attempted in vain to prevent. The result proved conclusively that Mrs. Dove's death had been occasioned by strychnia; every test applied showed the presence of strychnia in large quantity. A circumstance occurred subsequently which proves in a remarkable manner the power and subtlety of the poison. In making the examination of the body a small quantity of the blood had fallen on the floor, covering the space of a crown-piece. A week

after the funeral a woman was employed to clean up the room. A small spaniel dog followed this woman into the room, and was seen licking up this matter. His mistress pushed him away with a brush; and having finished her work, prepared to go home. As she left the house, the dog was suddenly attacked with spasms, fell on its back, and died almost immediately. After death, the dog's body was examined, and the presence of strychnia was detected in its blood. There was, therefore, no room to doubt that Mrs. Dove's death had been caused by strychnia; nor did the circumstantial evidence leave the slightest doubt that that strychnia had been administered by her husband.

The counsel for the prisoner argued first on the circumstantial evidence, to show how inconclusive it was, turning the open conversation of his client on the subject of strychnia, his acknowledged possession of that poison, and his apparent attention at his wife's bedside, to the best account. But he chiefly rested his chance of an acquittal on the proposition that the prisoner "had from his youth laboured under a moral defect of understanding;" one symptom of which he proved from learned authorities to be "an irresistible impulse to destroy life." In support of this proposition, the learned counsel produced a great number of brutal acts committed by the prisoner throughout his life. He then, as a further proof of this man's insanity, revealed the existence of ignorance and superstition disgraceful to the age and country, and to the baleful influence of which this murder is directly traceable. It appeared that there lived at Leeds a "wizard" named

Harrison, in whose skill the country people placed unbounded confidence, and whom they believed to possess all those powers attributed to magicians and witches in the dark ages. This impostor Dove frequently consulted; and when the desire of getting rid of his wife took possession of him, he employed this man to "torment" her. The wizard—of course not contemplating the murderous result—encouraged his brutality to his wife, and held out to him such promises of future happiness, that the desire of destroying her was ripened into practice, and the murder was consummated. Even after detection was inevitable, the confidence of the dupe remained unimpaired, and he firmly believed that the wizard could rescue him from his doom. In this correspondence, Dove seems to have admitted the correlative position that as the price of the Devil's agency, he had sold his own soul to the Evil One. It is impossible to penetrate into the recesses of the human mind, and therefore it cannot be said under what precise feeling the following extraordinary letter, written in his own blood, and found concealed in his clothes, was composed:—

"Dear Devil,

"If you will get me clear at the assizes, and let me have the enjoyment of life, health, wealth, tobacco here, more food and better, and my wishes granted till I am 60, come to me to-night.

"I remain,

"Your faithful subject,

"WILLIAM DOVE."

The physicians practising in insane cases called for the defence were of opinion that this letter was written seriously, and was one of the proofs of insanity; but when

they came to measure Dove's mind by any definition of insanity, their meaning became involved in a cloud of technicalities; the counsel for the Crown described them as "men called from madhouses who were half mad themselves," and treated the letter as part of a considered though stupid scheme of imposture.

The jury, after a brief deliberation, found a verdict of *Guilty*, but with a recommendation to mercy on the ground of "defective intellect." This verdict excited much comment; because, if the intellect was "defective," it was the duty of the jury, whatever might be the public feeling, to acquit the prisoner; but if it was not "defective," there was nothing in the case which gave the least ground for mercy. The effect was to throw the responsibility entirely on the Home Secretary; who considered that nothing had been shown which would take the case out of the category of wilful and deliberate murder, and the sentence was carried into effect, to the great satisfaction of all but a few crotchety persons.

For some time past it has been very properly determined by the authorities that that horrible curiosity which seeks to watch the last moments of a condemned wretch shall no longer be indulged. When, therefore, sentence has been passed the convict is placed in the condemned cell, and none but those who are closely connected with the unhappy man, his spiritual advisers, and others who can show sufficient grounds for requiring access, are admitted. Thus, while every proper indulgence is accorded with the utmost freedom, that mercenary intrusiveness, which lives by pandering to the vulgar curiosity, is absolutely excluded. On the

other hand, the chief officers of the gaols are permitted to give all proper information. The knowledge which thus travels through the gloomy bars of the prison-house is too scanty to serve as a basis for sound conclusion. It would appear, however, that from the moment the verdict was pronounced, all hope of life passed away from the convict Dove, and with it all attempt at deception as to his sanity. He could not, perhaps, be said to have a very lively sense of the enormity of his crime, or of the terrors of the future. But he admitted that he had committed a crime for which his life was justly forfeited, and he applied himself to his devotions with fervour. His demeanour, in short, showed no signs of insanity, though his intellect and sensations were dull. A day or two before his execution he dictated two papers of confession, of great length, and of so extraordinary a nature, that it is desirable some extracts should be given.

The first commences by numerous tales of his consultations with Harrison, "the Leeds wizard," upon matters of the most ordinary imposture—such as recovering articles stolen or lost, to remove strange noises in the house, to remove witchcraft from his cattle—in all which Harrison appears to have played off the commonplace tricks proper to his trade. His ascendancy over the mind of his dupe was confirmed by a successful prophecy that his father (who was ill) would die before the 25th December. He died on the 24th. When the dupe conceived his violent hatred to his wife, he hastened to consult the wizard. It is not to be supposed that Harrison contemplated any catastrophe—he probably only spoke to the

wishes or returned the words of his customer. But his influence was fatal.

"About August, 1855, I had some unpleasantness with my wife, and I went over to Harrison at Leeds. I told him of it, and he promised to make it all right. He told me that I must let him know by letter how things went on. In two days after this I wrote to him stating that my wife was no better, and that he must do something to cause peace. I sent this letter by a neighbour, named Fisher, who was a porter at the station, to post. Mrs. Dove knew that I had written a letter, but didn't know what about. She therefore sent the servant to Fisher's to get it back. She did so. Mrs. Dove then took my letter out of the envelope, and sent a blank sheet of paper instead. I was not aware of this at the time; but hearing some whispering, I suspected there was some deception about the matter. I then wrote another letter to the same effect to Harrison, and posted it myself the same day before 2 o'clock. At 3 o'clock I went by train to Leeds to see Harrison. When I arrived he had received the envelope with the blank sheet of paper therein and my letter. He inquired the reason of the blank sheet of paper, and I told him. I then again informed him of my unpleasantness and unhappiness with my wife. He then said, 'You never will have any happiness until she's out of the way.' I said, 'How do you know that?' He said, 'If you'll come up stairs, I'll tell you; for I've got your nativity marked out.' I then went up stairs with him. He there took out of a drawer a sheet of paper about the size of that

now used by you, and on which there was a circle drawn, with the signs of the zodiac. There were also hieroglyphical forms, opposite various figures denoting years, beginning at 27 (my age) and continuing down to 50 or 52. The figures after 27 were 32 repeated twice or three times. He referred to the forms opposite the various figures, and read from a book my destiny. He said that between the age of 27 and 32 everything would go against me, I should have nothing but misfortunes—that at 32 the sun and moon would come in conjunction (I think conjunction is the word he used), and that then everything would be in my favour; that at 32 years of age I should lose my wife, that at 32 I should marry again, that at 32 I should have a child, and that at 32 I should have an addition to my fortune, and that for my sake he did not care how soon it was here, for until then I should never be a happy man; that after I was 32 everything would go on well for a few years. He made other remarks as to different periods of my life.

"At this interview I asked him what description of woman I should marry for my second wife? He referred again to the same paper and to his book, and then said, 'The person that you ought to marry will have auburn hair, light complexion, and a good fortune,' and he added, 'If you had married a person of this description at first you would have done well.' * * * I saw Harrison again in November about my wife's temper. He said, 'Never mind, all will soon be right; she'll die before March or before the end of February'—I am not certain which he said; but when he told me

that my wife would die so soon I said to him that he had before told me that she would die 'at 32,' and he then answered, 'before 32,' but 'I did not say how much before.' * * * In a few days afterwards (after December 21) I went to the New Cross Inn, and Harrison came in, the newspaper was produced, and Harrison read about Palmer's case. I then asked him whether strychnia could be detected? He said 'No, nor yet any other vegetable poison.' I then said, 'What other vegetable poisons are there that cannot be detected?' He replied, 'Digitalis, bella-donna, particularly if it was crystallized.' These were all he remembered at the time. I then asked him if he could get or make me some strychnia. We had then got to our new house, and were much annoyed with cats. The house had been previously unoccupied, I wished to destroy the cats by poison. I had never heard of strychnia until Palmer's case arose. Harrison refused to get me the strychnia, and I told him that I could get it elsewhere.

"I went to him again in January last about my wife. I told him about my wife's temper, and he again said, 'She won't live long.' I told him that she was poorly then. He said, 'She'll never get better, as I told you before; she will die in February.' I had no further communication with Harrison until Thursday, the 6th of March, 1856. My wife died on the 1st of that month. On Thursday, the 6th of March, I went to the New Cross Inn, and after being there a few minutes I sent for Harrison. He came. I announced to him my wife's death, at the same informing him that an inquest was held as to my wife's death. He inquired the

reason why the inquest was held? I said, 'My wife died very suddenly, and Mr. Morley, the surgeon, cannot account for it, and it is known that I had strychnia in the house. Mr. Morley thinks some might have been spilt, and my wife have got some accidentally.' I then said to him, 'You told me that strychnia could not be detected, but I have since seen in the *Materia Medica* that it can. What is your opinion now? Can a grain or a grain and a-half be detected? For there is great difference of opinion on the subject. Professor Taylor says that it cannot be detected twenty-four hours after death in the human body.' Harrison said, 'What! have you poisoned your wife?' I replied, 'No; I should be very sorry.' Nothing further passed at this time.

"On Friday, the 7th of March, while the inquest was going on at Fleischmann's Hotel, I went to the back door of Harrison's house. This was about 3 o'clock in the afternoon. I then said to him that the inquest was going on—that several witnesses had been called, and that I was suspected of poisoning my wife; and I then said to him, 'How will the case go? Shall I be imprisoned?' He replied, 'It will be a very difficult case; but I can work you out.' I then said to him, 'You only say you can. Now tell me, will you?' Harrison replied, 'Set yourself altogether at rest; I will.'"

The second confession is given almost entire.

"I wish to repeat that the statement which I have previously made to you respecting Harrison is strictly true. Harrison has, during the time that I was at the farm at Bramham, and also when I lived at Normanton, and after-

wards at Leeds, frequently told me that I should never be happy until my wife was dead. This was when I was pressing Harrison to put a spell upon her, so that I might live happily with her. About the end of last year, or the beginning of this, I was in Harrison's warehouse, opposite his house, and he then told me that belladonna could not be found in the human body after death, particularly if it was in a crystallized state, and he then offered to make me some, but I did not request him to do so. At this interview he stated very positively that I should never be happy until she was out of the way. I had no desire at this time to get rid of my wife. My belief was that Harrison was possessed of some supernatural power, and that he could, through some influence, compel her to live happily with me. He kept continually telling me that I should not be happy until she was out of the way. I asked him in the month of February if he could do anything to get her out of the way, and he said he would lay her on a sick bed and she would never get better. The first strychnia was got, as mentioned by me in my former statement, on the 10th day of February last, and for the purpose of killing cats. It was not got for any other purpose, and at that time I never thought of poisoning my wife. The whole of the strychnia obtained on the 10th day of February was used for killing cats. The second quantity of strychnia was got by me, I believe, on the Thursday or Friday following, but I won't be sure as to the day. The first and second quantities of strychnia were kept in the razor-case, which was placed on the

mantelpiece in my bedroom. I did not, when I got the second quantity of strychnia, think of poisoning my wife. I should not have got the second quantity of strychnia but for the wish expressed by Mr. Morley's assistant to have the skin of a cat for a tobacco pouch. I had before this given a book to Harrison, and on the day that Elizabeth Fisher left our house I had considerable unpleasantness with my wife about Harrison having that book. She had a bad opinion of Harrison, and I think feared him. I had told her when at Normanton that he had predicted her death at the end of February. On the Saturday after Elizabeth Fisher left I took the paper containing the strychnia out of the razor-case, and put it in my waistcoat pocket. I then went to my mother's house. In the afternoon I had previously called at Mr. Morley's for my wife's medicine. It was an effervescing draught in two bottles. At my mother's that evening I took the cork out of one of the bottles and touched the wet end of it with the strychnia. I then put the cork in the bottle again and shook up the draught. Before this I ought to have stated that I had during that Saturday afternoon put a very small quantity of the strychnia, perhaps half of a quarter of a grain, in some jelly which my sister Jane brought from my mother's. My wife took a spoonful, and made a remark about how bitter it was, and she then requested Mrs. Fisher to take some. She did, and then remarked it was bitter as aloes. I then took a spoonful, but did not taste the bitterness. I then stated that I did not find the bitterness, and requested Mrs. Fisher to taste again, but she refused. I then

took a second spoonful and tasted the bitterness. I did not swallow any. The remainder was thrown away at that time. It was after this that I went to Mr. Morley's and my mother's. On that Saturday evening my wife took some of the draught in Mrs. Whitham's presence. Mrs. Whitham tasted it, and stated that it was bitter. The draught was not shaken that night before it was taken. My wife did not suffer from the effects of it at all. On the way from my mother's towards home on that Saturday I threw the remainder of the strychnia away. I cannot tell you the feelings of my mind when I put the strychnia into the jelly and into the mixture. I cannot describe them. I did not think at the moment when I put it in as to its effects or consequences. On the Sunday evening following, which was the 24th day of February, I went into Mr. Morley's surgery, and, there being no person in at the time, I took perhaps 10 grains of strychnia and folded it in paper. When I got home I placed it in the stable. On the Monday morning I gave my wife her draught (the effervescing mixture) about half-past 9, and at 10 o'clock she had the attack as mentioned by Mrs. Fisher and Mrs. Whitham. At the time my wife took that draught she complained very much of the bitterness, and added, that she would tell Mr. Morley about it. There were three or four doses left in the bottle after that draught was taken, and I broke the bottle in my wife's presence, fearing that Mr. Morley might taste it. The mixture was changed on the Monday. The mixture then given was very bitter. On the Tuesday night, or Wednesday morning, I applied the

wet end of the cork of the medicine bottle to the strychnia, as before. I think there might be from half a-grain to a grain of strychnia on the cork when I put it in the bottle. I shook the mixture up. There were then only two or three doses in the bottle. I don't remember my wife having any attack on the Wednesday. She took her mixture on that day. On the Thursday I got another bottle of medicine from Mr. Morley's, and I again applied the wet end of the cork to the strychnia as before. About the same quantity of strychnia adhered as on the former occasion. The last dose of that mixture was taken on Friday night, at 10 o'clock, and my wife was taken seriously ill in half an hour, but she had no arching of the back on that occasion that I recollect. Mrs. Fisher is mistaken, I think, on that point, but her statement in other respects is true, I believe. On that Friday night I got another bottle of medicine from Mr. Morley's. This mixture was directed to be taken four times a day. I did not put any strychnia into that mixture or medicine, and I did not put any upon the cork of the bottle. Mrs. Whitham gave a dose out of that bottle in the afternoon of Saturday. The strychnia was in the stable, where I had first placed it, and there was no strychnia in the razor case on that day, nor during any part of that week. I was drinking at Sutcliffe's public-house on that Saturday, and I was more or less affected by liquor all the afternoon and evening. About 3 o'clock in the afternoon I went into the stable and took about a grain and a half of strychnia out of the paper, and put it in another paper, which I placed in my waistcoat pocket. I put that strychnia

into the wineglass which contained a little water—I believe the water which was left in the glass by Mrs. Whitham after giving my wife the third dose in the afternoon; but I have no recollection as to the time when I put the strychnia into the glass. I gave the mixture in the evening, in the presence of Mrs. Whitham and Mrs. Wood, as stated by them in their evidence. I poured the mixture into that wineglass which contained the water and strychnia. I did not put the strychnia into the wineglass in the presence of Mrs. Whitham and Mrs. Wood, or either of them. I know that I put the strychnia in before, but I cannot remember how long before, giving the medicine. I did not, when I gave the medicine on the occasions mentioned, think of the consequences of giving it; but when I saw my wife suffering from the attack on the Saturday night,

it flashed across my mind that I had given her the strychnia, and that she would die from its effects. I was muddled before this, and did not know what I was doing. When the thoughts of her death crossed my mind, I immediately regretted what I had done, and I believe if Mr. Morley had come in at that moment, I should have told him what I had given her, so that he might have used means to restore her. I cannot disguise the anguish I felt when I returned from Mr. Morley's and found my wife dead. Palmer's case first called my attention to strychnia, but I never should have thought of using that or any other poison for the purpose of taking my poor wife's life but for Harrison, who was continually telling me that I should never have any happiness until my wife was out of the way."

PATENTS.

From January 1st to December 30th, 1856.

These Patents all bear date as of the day on which Provisional Protection was granted for the several inventions therein mentioned.

* * It is frequently difficult to make an abstract of the lengthy descriptions given by the patentees of their inventions, sufficiently short for the purposes of this list, and yet sufficiently accurate to indicate exactly the nature of the invention. It is hoped, however, that sufficient is given to afford to an inquirer the means of making more accurate researches in the official records.

-
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Abraham, carriages, Mar. 20 | Atkinson, steam boilers, Feb. 12 |
| Abraham, percussion caps, June 27 | Augier, aroma, April 1 |
| Achard, motive power, Jan. 18 | Auld, steam boilers, June 27 |
| Adams, time table Jan. 8 | Avery, windlasses, Jan. 29 |
| Adams, railways, Oct. 17 | Avery, detectors, Feb. 1 |
| Adams, railway wheels, Oct. 21 | Avery, gates and doors, Feb. 19 |
| Adcock, measuring, April 15 | Avery, handles for tools, Feb. 19 |
| Adkins, measuring fabrics, Oct. 17 | Avery, sewing machines, Feb. 22 |
| Ador, colours, Nov. 24 | Avery, closing vessels, Feb. 22 |
| Adshed, artificial plaster, Dec. 19 | Avery, bonnets, Nov. 18 |
| Advielle, silvering, April 1 | Bach, decorative glass, June 27 |
| Ager, locks and latches, June 24 | Baggs, steam engine, April 25 |
| Aikman, finishing fabrics, Nov. 14 | Baggs, telegraphs, Dec. 12 |
| Albright, lucifer matches, Nov. 28 | Bain, distributing liquids, Feb. 1 |
| Allan, engine valves, Jan. 22 | Bain, inkstands, July 11 |
| Allen, transport carriage, Jan. 22 | Baily, digging machine, May 23 |
| Allen, railways, May 6 | Baird, preparing skins, Nov. 14 |
| Allan, electricity, May 16 | Baker, register stoves, April 1 |
| Allan, steam-engines, Oct. 24 | Bakewell, ventilation, July 4 |
| Alliott, drying apparatus, Oct. 24 | Bakewell, bomb shells, Dec. 16 |
| Amet, garments, Dec. 16 | Balestrina, telegraphs, Nov. 25 |
| Amory, furnaces, Aug. 15 | Ball, stamping ores, Sept. 23 |
| Anderson, soap, April 15 | Ball, separating metals, Sept. 26 |
| Anderson, felt, May 20 | Balmain, chemicals, June 27 |
| Andre Drieu, weaving, July 11 | Bannehr, preparing paper, Sept. 19 |
| Antrobus, packing flour, April 11 | Baptiste, mortices, July 11 |
| Appleton, knives, May 23 | Barber, steam engines, Feb. 1 |
| Appleton, knitting machine, June 20 | Barbier, brick-kiln, April 1 |
| Archer, photography, Jan. 15 | Barbour, sawing apparatus, June 24 |
| Archer, envelopes, Aug. 26 | Barcroft, baskets, Mar. 4 |
| Ardouin, corking machine, Mar. 25 | Barling, paper, Mar. 4 |
| Armier, motive power, June 27 | Barlon, spinning mule, Mar. 25 |
| Armitage, iron, Oct. 14 | Barlon, bridges, June 24 |
| Armstrong, lifting machine, Oct. 21 | Barlow, seasoning timber, July 25 |
| Arnaud, motive power, July 25 | Barlow, cutting cloth, Aug. 26 |
| Asbury, stop-cocks, July 22 | Barlow, steam engines, Aug. 26 |
| Ashworth, cap machines, July 4 | Barlow, railway rails, Sept. 5 |
| Aspinall, curing sugar, June 10 | Barlow, surveying, Dec. 2 |
| Aspinall, curing sugar, Aug. 22 | Barnes, railway rails, May 2 |
| Aston, fire-arms, Feb. 29 | Barnes, carriage lamps, July 15 |
| Atkin, lace machine, Dec. 2 | Barnes, cornice poles, July 15 |
| Atkins, gas regulator, April 11 | Barrans, steam engines, Oct. 10 |

- Barratte, rotatory engine, Sept. 5
 Barreswil, gas meters, Aug. 8
 Barrie, reflective leveller, July 4
 Barron, coating metals, Aug. 8
 Barrow, soda and acids, Aug. 8
 Barrow, motive power, Dec. 30
 Barruel, treating seeds, Nov. 14
 Barsham, bottle cases, Aug. 19
 Bartholomew, propellers, April 18
 Barton, shuttles, June 17
 Basford, coal gas, Jan. 12
 Basford, purifying coal, Aug. 12
 Bauzemont, turpentine, Sept. 23
 Bayley, carding cotton, April 8
 Baylis, needles, Aug. 12
 Bayliss, metallic tubes, Nov. 18
 Beads, spinning machine, April 29
 Beamish, leather, April 4
 Beardsell, mohair cloths, May 23
 Beasley, fire arms, July 22
 Beatson, railway crossings, April 25
 Beattie, furnaces, Jan. 8
 Beattie, railway wheels, Jan. 8
 Beattie, folding mattress, Jan. 25
 Beauche, cigars, Nov. 7
 Bedells, elastic fabrics, Jan. 15
 Beech, railway chair, Dec. 2
 Bell, woven fabrics, May 23
 Bell, fuzees, Aug. 12
 Bell, ornamental fabrics, Sept. 19
 Bellamy, graining, April 22
 Belleville, smoke consumer, Mar. 25
 Belleville, generating steam, Dec. 9
 Bellford, steam valves, Jan. 8
 Bellford, condensers, Jan. 12
 Bellford, sewing machines, Feb. 19
 Bellford, fountain lamps, Feb. 19
 Bellford, fire-arms, Feb. 22
 Bellford, ventilating hats, Mar. 25
 Benfield, propellers, Jan. 22
 Beniouski, logotypes, Aug. 8
 Bental, pulping turnips, Mar. 14
 Bentall, turnip-cutting machine, June 17
 Bentall, crushing grain, July 22
 Bentley, fire-arms, Jan. 22
 Bentley, fire-arms, Sept. 30
 Benton, motive power, April 15
 Bergeon, spittoon, May 20
 Bergner, embossing, Aug. 1
 Bernard, boots and shoes, April 1
 Bernard, boots and shoes, Sept. 23
 Berrisford, weaving looms, Nov. 4
 Berthiez, engines, Dec. 19
 Bessemer, anchors, April 11
 Bessemer, railway bars, April 11
 Bessemer, cast steel, April 11
 Bessemer, metal beams, April 11
 Bessemer, projectiles, April 11
 Bessemer, railway wheels, April 11
 Bessemer, iron, June 3
 Bessemer, iron and steel, June 24
 Bessemer, bar iron, Aug. 8
 Bessemer, iron and steel, Aug. 22
 Bessemer, shaping metals, Sept. 19
 Bessemer, iron and steel, Nov. 14
 Bessemer, iron and steel, Nov. 18
 Bessemer, iron and steel, Nov. 25
 Bestwick, cocks and taps, July 29
 Betjemann, tables, Feb. 15
 Betteley, rolling iron, July 1
 Betts, artificial spheres, Sept. 26
 Beudant, treating ores, Sept. 26
 Biddell, railway crossings, Mar. 7
 Bilbe, ships and vessels, Dec. 24
 Billing, waterproof fabric, June 10
 Billing, paper bags, July 4
 Billington, railway sleepers, Sept. 2
 Birch, school desks, June 27
 Bird, castors, July 15
 Blackburn, bleaching, Feb. 8
 Blacket, locks and keys, Oct. 17
 Blackstone, corks and bungs, Sept. 5
 Blackwell, heating fluids, May 6
 Blackwell, air passages, Dec. 16
 Blackwood, doubling yarn, Nov. 11
 Blake, transparent bodies, Sept. 26
 Blittkowski, fire-arms, June 24
 Bodmer, plain meter, Feb. 22
 Bodmer, hydraulic, April 4
 Bodmer, lubricating oil, April 11
 Bodmer, spinning cotton, Sept. 9
 Bonvallet, printing fabrics, Nov. 21
 Borland, spinning, Feb. 8
 Borland, fibrous mineral, Sept. 20
 Boss, preparing cane, Sept. 26
 Bouchard, gas, Feb. 29
 Bouchet, propellers, Jan. 22
 Bouillotte, copying press, May 6
 Bousfield, boots and shoes, Jan. 12
 Bousfield, iron shafts, Jan. 22
 Bousfield, coal-hole cover, Feb. 8
 Bousfield, fire-arms, Feb. 8
 Bousfield, fire-arms, Feb. 15
 Bousfield, power looms, Mar. 25
 Bousfield, piled fabrics, April 18
 Bousfield, piled fabrics, April 18
 Bousfield, fatty matters, April 25
 Bousfield, steam engines, June 17
 Bousfield, power looms, July 25
 Bousfield, moulding planes, Aug. 12
 Bousfield, flexible tube, Sept. 30
 Bousfield, pumps, Sept. 30
 Bousfield, driving bands, Oct. 3
 Bousfield, india-rubber thread, Oct. 3
 Bousfield, artificial stone, Dec. 2
 Bousfield, propellers, Dec. 30
 Bouwens, steam engine, Oct. 10
 Bower, screws, Aug. 8
 Bower, bolts and rivets, Sept. 26
 Bowers, railways, Aug. 15
 Boyd, scythes, Aug. 15
 Bracegirdle, dressing flour, June 1

- Bradford, rudders, Dec. 30
 Brae, communicating signals, Dec. 2
 Bragg, finishing fabrics, Sept. 26
 Brasseur, winding machine, Feb. 26
 Bremner, envelopes, Dec. 30
 Bridgewater, roofing, Jan. 25
 Bridson, textile fabrics, Jan. 22
 Brierley, twisting yarns, July 4
 Brierley, self-acting mule, Sept. 19
 Brierley, weaving looms, Sept. 19
 Briggs, blocks and bricks, Nov. 25
 Bright, telegraphs, Feb. 29
 Britten, projectiles, Jan. 25
 Brook, woven fabrics, May 6
 Brook, finishing yarns, Nov. 25
 Brooke, lift pumps, June 17
 Brooman, pipes, Jan. 4
 Brooman, wheels, Jan. 8
 Brooman, pasteboard Jan. 15
 Brooman, umbrellas, Feb. 15
 Brooman, raw silk, Feb. 26
 Brooman, water gauge, Feb. 29
 Brooman, preserving food, Mar. 4
 Brooman, knitting machine, Mar. 7
 Brooman, fire-arms, April 18
 Brooman, glass paper, April 22
 Brooman, motive power, May 16
 Brooman, treating minerals, May 16
 Brooman, treating beetroot, May 20
 Brooman, gas from peat, May 30
 Brooman, excavating machine, June 24
 Brooman, cast steel, July 22
 Brooman, alcohol, July 22
 Brooman, ladies' garments, Aug. 5
 Brooman, brewing, Aug. 5
 Brooman, preserving substances, Aug. 12.
 Brooman, slide valves, Aug. 29
 Brooman, centrifugal machine, Oct. 7
 Brooman, regulating gas, Oct. 14
 Brooman, plating glass, Oct. 21
 Brooman, treating guano, Oct. 24
 Brooman, felting hats, Oct. 24
 Brooman, cranes, Oct. 24
 Brooman, tyres and hoops, Oct. 27
 Brooman, tubes and pipes, Nov. 7
 Brooman, printing shawls, Nov. 18
 Brooman, spoons and forks, Dec. 5
 Brooman, gas light, Dec. 9
 Brough, buckles, Jan. 29
 Brown, folding chairs, Jan. 18
 Brown, paper bags, Feb. 1
 Brown, bayonets, Feb. 8
 Brown, conveyance of heat, May 20
 Brown, railway switches, June 6
 Brown, cast steel, June 20
 Brown, hinges, July 4
 Brown, iron bedstead, Sept. 12
 Brown, ash pans, Sept. 23
 Brown, iron, Nov. 4
 Brown, hats and caps, Dec. 19
 Browne, bricks, April 11
 Brunel, Prussian blue, Sept. 26
 Bryant, charcoal, May 23
 Buff, purifying water, Sept. 9
 Buffon, purifying liquids, Nov. 21
 Bull, inkstands, Feb. 12
 Bull, railroads, Feb. 29
 Bullough, lubricators, May 30
 Bullough, sizing machine, June 24
 Bullough, looms, Dec. 19
 Bulmer, bricks, Oct. 14.
 Burden, horse shoes, Dec. 16
 Burg, steam boilers, Sept. 19
 Burleigh, railway way, July 29
 Burnaud, fire arms, Dec. 24
 Burnett, telegraphs, Dec. 2
 Burnside, propellers, June 20
 Burrell, hydraulic machine, June 20
 Burrige, glass, April 11
 Burrows, winding apparatus, May 9
 Burton, treating flax, May 30
 Burton, dressing warps, Dec. 12
 Burton, washing machine, Dec. 30
 Burton, warming houses, Dec. 30
 Butcher, bobbins, Feb. 29
 Butler, locks, Jan. 22
 Byford, horses' bits, Dec. 30
 Byrne, sauce, Jan. 8
 Cadet, inking apparatus, Dec. 2
 Caithness, Earl of, cutting stone, Nov. 4
 Calvert, carding cotton, Nov. 4
 Cambridge, clod crusher, Nov. 25
 Cameron, cranes, Sept. 19
 Campbell, reaping machine, Oct. 17
 Cantelo, preserving vegetables, Oct. 21
 Capp, improved lamp, May 2
 Capron, cupping, Feb. 26
 Carey, water casts, July 15
 Carey, shower baths, Nov. 18
 Carey, infusions in coffee, Nov. 18
 Carless, artificial leather, Feb. 22
 Carrington, hats, May 2
 Carter, propellers, Nov. 11
 Cartwright, steam-engines, Sept. 26
 Cartwright, chain arrows, Dec. 24
 Castro, propellers, Nov. 4
 Chadburn, pressure gauge, Oct. 17
 Chadwick, motive power, March 25
 Chaffer, cutting slate, June 6
 Chalmers, woven fabrics, March 18
 Chambers, railway breaks, July 11
 Chambers, agricultural drills, Nov. 25
 Chambor, fire-places, Oct. 10
 Chance, moulded articles, July 8
 Chance, flattening glass, July 25
 Chandler, roasting-jack, Feb. 29
 Chandler, agricultural engine, Dec. 9
 Chapman, propellers, April 11
 Chapuis, reflectors, April 29
 Charlton, steam-engines, Nov. 14
 Charlton, steam generators, Dec. 24
 Charrite, small shot, Sept. 26

- Charton, manometer, Feb. 12
 Chateaufneuf, washing machine, Aug. 22
 Chauchard, paper from wood, July 1
 Chenot, metallic sponges, Sept. 5
 Chenot, extracting substances, Sept. 5
 Chenot, metallic oxydes, Sept. 5
 Chenot, separating metals, Sept. 5
 Chesterman, springs of knives, May 27
 Chisholm, artificial manure, June 27
 Chrimes, railway buffers, Sept. 26
 Christophers, knives and forks, Dec. 2
 Church, fire-arms, March 11
 Church, ordnance, April 15
 Claeij's, cork, April 15
 Clark, chain wheels, Feb. 12
 Clark, electric telegraphs, April 29
 Clark, bolts and fastenings, May 20
 Clark, stopping bottles, Aug. 1
 Clark, gas, Oct. 17
 Clark, looking glasses, Nov. 4
 Clark, hydraulic heaters, Dec. 24
 Clark, digging apparatus, Dec. 24
 Clark, churns, Dec. 30
 Clarke, lanterns, March 4
 Clarke, warp fabrics, Aug. 19
 Clarkson, pumps and tubes, June 6
 Claus, hides and skins, Feb. 19
 Claus, hides or skins, July 15
 Claus, ship building, Aug. 15
 Clay, bar iron, April 18
 Clay, wrought iron, June 27
 Clayton, soap, Sept. 26
 Clegg, loom harness, Jan. 18
 Clement, railway breaks, April 4
 Cliff, furnaces, May 16
 Clifford, boat lashes, Nov. 28
 Coates, bleaching fabrics, Aug. 26
 Coats, horseshoes, June 10
 Cocker, wire, May 27
 Cockings, whip handles, April 11
 Cockkenifeck, fatty matters, Nov. 4.
 Coignet, artificial stone, May 20
 Colby, altimeter, Jan. 29
 Coleman, ploughing, Nov. 14
 Collier, weaving carpets, Jan. 22
 Collier, piled fabrics, Jan. 25
 Collier, hot pressing, May 16
 Collier, finishing fabrics, May 16
 Collier, woven fabrics, June 10
 Collins, agricultural implement, Sept. 23
 Colman, steam boilers, Nov. 4
 Colson, bread, Dec. 5
 Coltman, knitting machine, Oct. 10
 Comb, carding tow, Aug. 12
 Comstock, generating steam, July 4
 Conant, fire-arms, Nov. 21
 Condy, acetic acid, Dec. 2
 Coniam, tiles, March 4
 Connor, looms for weaving, Aug. 22
 Cook, preserving surfaces, March 14
 Cook, rivetting, April 11
 Cook, bedsteads, Sept. 5
 Cook, dyeing yarns, Sept. 5
 Cooke, furniture moulds, Jan. 25
 Cooke, stubbing frames, May 6
 Cooke, knife cleaner, May 16
 Cooling pumps, Feb. 26
 Cope, spoons, forks, and ladles, May 16
 Cope, pearl buttons, Sept. 26
 Corbett, blast furnaces, July 4
 Cornes, consuming smoke, Feb. 19
 Cornes, washing machine, Aug. 12
 Cornforth, plated teapots, June 6
 Cornides, transferring prints, Mar. 18
 Cornides, window blinds, Nov. 14
 Cornides, ornamenting wood, Dec. 24
 Cotsell, gutters and kerb, May 2
 Cottam, folding bedsteads, May 20
 Cottam, spinning cotton, May 27
 Cottam, chairs and seats, May 30
 Cotton, looped fabrics, Mar. 14
 Cottrill, washing machine, Mar. 20
 Cottrill, washing machine, April 15
 Cottrill, presses, Sept. 30
 Cottrill, filing machine, Dec. 5
 Coulon, composing machine, Oct. 7
 Coulson, teapots, &c., Mar. 11
 Coutinho, motive power, Mar. 25
 Coward, paddle-wheels, Nov. 21
 Cowburn, steam boilers, Mar. 18
 Cowley, paper, Sept. 23
 Cowper, preserving wood, April 25
 Cowper, combing wool, June 24
 Cowper, treating coal, Sept. 26
 Cowper, candles, Nov. 11
 Cox, artificial fuel, Feb. 8
 Cox, leather, April 15
 Cox, coke ovens, Nov. 7
 Craigie, heating rooms, Sept. 26
 Crampton, furnaces, June 3
 Craven, weaving, April 15
 Crawford, weaving, Feb. 15
 Craymer, propellers, Mar. 4
 Crickmay, fire-arms, April 22
 Crockett, evaporation, Dec. 5
 Crockett, sulphuric acid, Dec. 5
 Crofton, inking stamps, Dec. 19
 Crofts, lace weaving, Nov. 4
 Crosier, street watering, July 29
 Crosland, furnaces, Oct. 21
 Crosley, projectiles, Jan. 4
 Crosley, gas meter, Jan. 25
 Crosley, gas meters, June 24
 Crossley, printing yarns, Nov. 14
 Crum, bread, April 18
 Cumming, footstool, Sept. 26
 Curtis, fog signals, June 3
 Curtis, axles, Oct. 7
 Curtis, railways, Nov. 4
 Curwood, knife cleaner, Nov. 14
 Cutler, metallic pipes, July 18
 Daft, metallic bedsteads, June 6
 Daft, cast-iron pipes, Dec. 2
 Daines, stone surfaces, April 18

- Dale, chemicals, Mar. 11
 Dalgety, barrel tilt, July 1
 Dalgety, vices, July 15
 Damazio, heating gas, Dec. 12
 Danchell, steam pressure, May 2
 Danduran, diving apparatus, Feb. 8
 Daniel, locks and keys, Sept. 26
 D'Ariverngne, portable desks, July 4
 David, bleaching, Aug. 12
 Davies, boilers, Jan. 25
 Davies, fodder, Feb. 29
 Davies, telegraphs, June 17
 Davies, nuting cast iron, Sept. 12
 Davies, measuring liquids, Nov. 18
 Davies, railway breaks, Nov. 21
 Davies, umbrellas, Dec. 12
 Davis, taps and cocks, April 29
 Davis, furnace bars, May 2
 Davis, vices, June 3
 Davis, small coke, Sept. 19
 Davis, pipe stems, Oct. 10
 Davonst, cartridges, Feb. 8
 Davy, weaving looms, Sept. 9
 Dawson, bedsteads, Jan. 18
 Dawson, coal fuel, Mar. 14
 Dawson, steam-engine, Nov. 11
 Day, door locks, July 25
 Deacon, carriage bodies, Dec. 30
 Deakin, bayonets, Feb. 26
 De Berenger, noscbags, Dec. 12
 De Bergevin, preparing coal, July 29
 De Berque, railway ways, July 18
 De Bussac, hydriodic acid, Feb. 15
 De Chateauneuf, gas meter, July 8
 Deffries, gas fires, Oct. 21
 De Fonbonne, coke for blasting, July 15
 De Fontainemoreau, batteries, Jan. 8
 De Fontainemoreau, weaving, Feb. 1
 De Fontainemoreau, fatty acids, Feb. 1
 De Fontainemoreau, forging, March 14
 De Fontainemoreau, horse gear, May 20
 De Fontainemoreau, motive power, May 23
 De Fontainemoreau, looms, June 6
 De Fontainemoreau, nails, June 27
 De Fontainemoreau, railways, July 1
 De Fontainemoreau, fatty matters, July 8
 De Fontainemoreau, cicatrising preparation, Aug. 1
 De Fontainemoreau, looms, Aug. 29
 De Fontainemoreau, churns, Sept. 17
 De Fontainemoreau, telegraphs, Sept. 26
 De Fontainemoreau, measuring, Sept. 30
 De Fontainemoreau, ship-building, Nov. 11
 De Fontainemoreau, packing, Dec. 5
 Defries, thrashing machine, April 25
 Deiss, extracting oils, July 29
 De Jongh, separating fibres, July 25
 De Kleinsorgen, compass, March 14
 De La Haichois, paving, Sept. 12
 De Lignac, preserving substances, April 1
 Delpardange, joining pipes, Jan. 29
 De Lucenay, gun batteries, March 11
 Demait, preserving substances, April 1
 De Malbee, water closets, Feb. 26
 Dempsey, air passages, Sept. 26
 De Normandy, chemicals, Aug. 5
 Denton, looms, Feb. 22
 Derham, steam engines, Sept. 30
 Dering, galvanic batteries, April 4
 Dering, galvanic batteries, Oct. 10.
 Desautoy, cutting machine, April 15
 Deschamps, diving boat, Jan. 12
 Desnos, furnaces, Aug. 8
 Déssales, oil lamps, July 25
 Destibeaux, waterproof fabric, May 16
 Deurance, pianofortes, March 11
 Devaux, granaries, Jan. 22
 Devaux, granaries, June 17
 Devaux, granaries, Aug. 12
 Devy, hair fabrics, Feb. 5
 Dewar, transmitting motion, May 20
 Dewick, rib machines, Aug. 26
 Dick, gas regulator, June 20
 Dickens, spinning machines, April 4
 Diment, cement, April 25
 Dimfel, screw-nuts, Aug. 26
 Dimpeel, railroad ways, Sept. 26
 Dimpeel, steam boilers, Nov. 4
 Distin, musical instruments, May 21
 Distin, smoking pipes, July 1
 Dixon, propellers, Sept. 5
 Dixon, measuring water, Dec. 22
 Doat, galvanic battery, Oct. 7
 Dobson, preparing linen, April 22
 Dodds, fire-arms, April 15
 Dodge, waterproofing, April 1
 Dodge, leather cloth, April 1
 Dodge, india-rubber, April 1
 Doran, pneumatic apparatus, July 25
 Donglass, lighthouses, March 14
 Downie, shaping metals, Aug. 5
 Draper, oil can, Jan. 25
 Drayson, gunpowder, Jan. 25
 Dreschfeld, looms, June 24
 Dresser, printing, June 3
 Drew, weaving, Aug. 8
 Dring, wood-pegs, April 11
 Drummond, spring hinges, Sept. 17
 Drury, steam boilers, Sept. 17
 Duckworth, woven fabrics, June 13
 Dufresne, gilding steel, Aug. 29
 Dumas, tiles, May 30.
 Dumery, shoes and boots, Aug. 15
 Dumery, smoke prevention, Aug. 19
 Dumery, counting apparatus, Dec. 24
 Du Motay, fatty matters, Jan. 25
 Du Motay, treating cast iron, May 6
 Duncan, generating steam, July 15
 Duncker, electric telegraphs, May 9
 Dunlop, oxides, Feb. 22
 Dunn, boilers, July 8
 Dunncliffe, weaving, May 23
 Duppa, generating steam, April 18
 Durant, distance table, March 4

- Durant, fire escape, Mar. 4
 Durant, sweeping chimneys, Mar. 4
 Durham, machine grease, Feb. 1
 Durrich, gas burners, Dec. 12
 Duyck, oil cake, Aug. 1
 Dyer, reefing sails, Aug. 26
 Dyer, reefing sails, Dec. 2
 Dyson, iron, Sept. 19
 Eadon, band saws, Dec. 24
 Eassie, hammers, May 16
 Eastwood, worsted machine, April 29
 Edwards, motive power, Jan. 12
 Eives, fibres from plants, June 27
 Eives, dynamometer, Aug. 8
 Eives, extracting oil, Aug. 8
 Elce, moderator lamps, May 2
 Elce, lubricators, Aug. 8
 Elliott, spinning machine, July 29.
 Ellis, ammonia, Jan. 8
 Ellis, artificial manure, Dec. 9
 Ellisdon, castors, May 23
 Emanuel, spoons, April 1
 Emile Paris, enamel, Jan. 25.
 Ensor, bobbin-net machine, Mar. 11
 Erskine, sizing fabrics, May 2
 Eskholme, ball-cocks, Dec. 24
 Esplin, gas meter, Feb. 1
 Evans, railway bars, April 11
 Evans, digging machinery, May 27
 Evans, ploughs, Nov. 14
 Evans, harness, Nov. 25
 Exall, sawing machine, May 27
 Fairbairn, carriages, April 11
 Fairclough, dining tables, Dec. 12
 Farini, tooth powder, Nov. 24
 Farmer, chain links, Oct. 24
 Farmer, iron and steel, Nov. 21
 Faucett, carpets, July 29
 Fawcett, carpets, Feb. 12
 Feather, shell and ball, Jan. 22.
 Fehrman, lamps, Sept. 26
 Fell, cooking apparatus, June 3
 Ferrier, cleansing, roads, Dec. 5
 Field, railway rails, Jan. 25
 Field, embossing, Feb. 19
 Field, paraffine candles, Aug. 19.
 Fillier, weaving loom, Jan. 25
 Finch, coal machine, Feb. 8
 Finyel, filtering sugar, Oct. 24
 Firmin, acids, Aug. 8
 Firth, mohair cloth, Dec. 24
 Fisher, tobacco machine, April 1
 Fisher, pianofortes, April 4
 Fisher, coating metals, Sept. 26
 Fisher, anchors, Oct. 3
 Fleetwood, making malt, May 2
 Fleming, bleaching, Mar. 7
 Fleming, bleaching fabrics, Nov. 25
 Fletcher, nuts and bolts, May 6
 Fletcher, weighing cranes, Aug. 1
 Fletcher, sweeping chimneys, Nov. 21
 Fonrobert, artificial leech, May 23
 Foot, propelling trucks, Feb. 26
 Foot, weaving, Sept. 23
 Forbes, fire-arms, Oct. 14
 Forbush, sewing machine, Jan. 18
 Ford, caoutchouc, Mar. 11
 Forlong, manure, April 25
 Forot, parasols, Feb. 12
 Forrest, metals, April 15
 Foster, drying wool, Feb. 12
 Foster, power looms, April 4
 Foster, looms for weaving, May 20
 Foster, trap-doors, Oct. 21
 Foster, fastenings, Nov. 28
 Fouchier, millstones, Feb. 8
 Foulds, power looms, Nov. 14
 Fourdrinier, knife cleaner, Feb. 26
 Fowler, ploughing machine, Mar. 20
 Fowler, ploughs, Mar. 25
 Fowler, ploughing, June 17
 Fowler, bricks and tiles, June 17
 Fowler, ploughing, Dec. 30
 Fox, carriage springs, Aug. 5
 Foxwell, sewing machines, July 29
 Fractaniel, safety rein, Oct. 7
 Francis, metallic boats, April 22
 Francis, cement, May 6
 Francis, cutting cloth, June 3
 Fraser, paper, Feb. 1
 Fraser, paper pulp, Mar. 4
 Free, sowing machine, Aug. 1
 Friend, registering log, June 10
 Frost, flower, Nov. 25
 Fuller, ice-pails, June 17
 Fuller, India-rubber tyres, Sept. 26
 Funcke, tanning skins, Aug. 5
 Furguson, preparing timber, Dec. 30
 Gaget, bookbinding, Nov. 11
 Gallop, doors and windows, Nov. 18
 Galloway, steam boilers, Sept. 26
 Galloway, propellers, Sept. 30
 Galloway, dye woods, Nov. 4
 Garand, cutting vencers, Mar. 7
 Garbai, tooth-powder, Feb. 22
 Garden, hats, April 1
 Gardissal, fatty matters, July 1
 Gardissal, fibrous products, Aug. 5
 Gardissal, steam boilers, Aug. 15
 Gardissal, capstans, Aug. 15
 Gardissal, ships' windlasses, Aug. 19
 Gardissal, screw valves, Sept. 5
 Gardissal, sweeping streets, Sept. 19
 Gardissal, engraving glass, Nov. 28
 Gardner, dressing machine, Jan. 12
 Gardner, salt, Jan. 25
 Gardner, watches, April 25
 Gardner, glass, June 3
 Gardner, heating and drying, July 22
 Garn, carts, Feb. 29
 Garnett, twisting yarn, Oct. 21
 Garside, weaving carpets, Sept. 26

- Gatty, lake colours, April 1
 Gatty, vesta lights, Aug. 5
 Gatty, dying, Dec. 5
 Gaudibert, watch guards, April 15
 Gauntlett, thermometric apparatus, Oct. 3
 Gavioli, musical instruments, Jan. 12
 Gedge, furnaces, Jan. 12
 Gedge, cutting paper, June 10
 Gedge, distilling gas, Nov. 18
 Gedge, mineral manure, Nov. 24
 Gerish, cast hinges, June 17
 Getley, drawing water, July 22
 Gibbs, picture frames, Mar. 14
 Gibon, treating metals, Aug. 29
 Gibson, bricks and tiles, Nov. 7
 Gidley, Indian rubber, Nov. 28
 Gilbee, boats, Feb. 5
 Gilbee, purifying oils, Feb. 26
 Gilbee, silicate of potash, April 1
 Gilbee, glass, Sept. 26
 Gilbert, piano-fortes, Dec. 2
 Gilchrist, ornamental weaving, Aug. 5.
 Giller, gas shades, Jan. 8
 Gillett, artificial teeth, Jan. 8
 Gimson, steam pipes, July 22
 Gladstone, masts, April 11
 Glass, deodorizing, Feb. 29
 Glover, knapsacks, Feb. 1
 Glover, clearing railways, June 6
 Glover, measuring solids, June 13
 Glover, breakwaters, June 13
 Glover, woven fabrics, Sept. 19
 Goddard, carding engines, Nov. 4
 Godding, dress fastenings, Jan. 22
 Gold, warming by steam, Oct. 7
 Golding, boots and shoes, Feb. 19
 Golding, leather, Feb. 19
 Golding, distilling, June 17
 Goldner, cooking apparatus, April 1
 Goll, buttonings, Dec. 9
 Gomme, metal wares, Mar. 11
 Gontier, treating oils, Feb. 1
 Good, thrashing, Jan. 8
 Goode, gas stoves, Oct. 24
 Goodheart, bars and gratings, Dec. 16
 Goodman, knitting machine, April 18
 Goodyear, boots and shoes, April 25
 Goose, cut nails, April 15
 Gordon, telegraphs, Jan. 8
 Gordon, generating steam, Sept. 26
 Gossage, carbonates, Jan. 8
 Gossage, sulphuric acid, Sept. 5
 Gossage, soap, Nov. 14
 Graham, paper-hangings, Jan. 8
 Graham, marine compasses, May 20
 Graham, dressing machine, Aug. 15
 Gratrix, watchmen's registers, Dec. 16
 Gray, water-closets, Feb. 22
 Gray, compasses, Mar. 25
 Greaves, steam boilers, Mar. 25
 Greaves, weaving looms, Sept. 9
 Greaves, railway ways, Sept. 26
 Green, tents and huts, Sept. 9
 Green, mowing machine, Dec. 9
 Green, buttons, Dec. 16
 Greene, fire-arms, Aug. 1
 Greening, washing machine, Jan. 12
 Greenock, motive power, Nov. 18
 Greenshields, dryers, Jan. 15
 Greenshields, railway sleepers, Sept. 26
 Greenwood, heating water, May 20
 Gregory, camp furniture, Feb. 8
 Gregory, roofing tiles, Sept. 26
 Grenet, motive power, Feb. 22
 Gretton, brewing, July 8
 Grey, dressing cloths, April 29
 Grey, moulding bricks, June 10
 Grey, steam boilers, July 29
 Grice, bolts and rivets, Sept. 19
 Griffiths, taps, April 29
 Griffiths, colliery brake, July 29
 Grimwade, treating milk, April 1
 Grist, casks and barrels, June 10
 Grosrenaud, puddling metals, Aug. 8
 Groves, tune barrels, Nov. 4
 Gruet, lamps, Mar. 18
 Guerin, railway brakes, Nov. 21
 Guerinot, railway trains, July 25
 Guido, cleansing wool, June 27
 Guilbert, bridles, Mar. 20
 Guillaume, wheels, Jan. 4
 Gulliver, signal bell, Aug. 8
 Gurlt, iron and steel, Dec. 19
 Gurney, heating air, Dec. 16
 Gwynne, pressure, May 20
 Gwynne, fatty matters, June 17
 Hacking, furnaces, May 16
 Haddan, cannon, Feb. 1
 Haddan, omnibuses, July 18
 Haddan, projectiles, Dec. 30
 Hadden, circular frames, May 16
 Hague, driving bands, Dec. 16
 Hahner, treatment of ores, May 27
 Haines, gun-boats, July 1
 Haley, railway buffers, May 6
 Halkett, motive power, April 1
 Hall, steam boilers, Feb. 8
 Hall, jacquard looms, June 10
 Hall, stoves, July 4
 Hall, treating pictures, Aug. 15
 Hallen, railway signals, July 4
 Hallen, railway signals, Sept. 26
 Halliwell, self-acting mules, Oct. 3
 Hamilton, weighing machine, Mar. 14
 Hamilton, railways, April 18
 Hamilton, telegraphs, April 18
 Hampton, iron, Jan. 25
 Hancock, barrels, Feb. 12
 Hancock, separating ores, May 16
 Hancock, motive power, Dec. 19
 Hands, preserving food, Feb. 29
 Hannah, pottery kilns, Aug. 12

- Hanson, digging machine, Feb. 29
 Hanson, signal lamps, Mar. 20
 Hanson, fire-arms, April 1
 Hansor, illuminating gas, June 24
 Harcourt, bell cranks, Mar. 20
 Hardacre, carriages, Oct. 17
 Harding, flax and silk, April 15
 Harding, cloth bonnets, Sept. 26
 Hardon, weaving looms, Dec. 5
 Hardy, ointment, Feb. 19
 Harfield, screw-nuts, April 18
 Harfield, metallic nuts, Aug. 15
 Hargraves, dyeing fabrics, May 30
 Harlow, water-closets, Sept. 19
 Harrington, umbrellas, Sept. 19
 Harrison, woven fabrics, Jan. 25
 Harrison, worsted machine, May 16
 Harrison, carriage axles, Aug. 12
 Harrison, producing cold, Sept. 23
 Harrison, distilling heat, Sept. 23
 Harrison, warping machine, Dec. 19
 Harrop, spinning mules, June 10
 Hart, thrashing machine, Jan. 12
 Hart, steam engines, Mar. 14
 Hart, leakage indicator, May 23
 Hart, railway signals, June 10
 Hartcliffe, cotton machine, May 20
 Hartley, safety valves, April 25
 Hartman, printing stuffs, Feb. 8
 Harvey, portfolios, Mar. 4
 Harvey, winding machine, April 18
 Harvey, boring and drilling, Aug. 26
 Hatton, metallic tubes, Nov. 28
 Hawker, cartridges, May 30
 Hawkes, water-closets, April 25
 Hawkins, wire chain, Nov. 11
 Haworth, belts and bands, June 10
 Hawthorn, steam pump, July 15
 Hay, pearl barley, Sept. 19
 Hayes, weaving looms, Sept. 12
 Healey, forging, April 22
 Heaton, self-acting doors, Sept. 19
 Heaton, balance weights, Nov. 4
 Heaven, embroidering, Feb. 5
 Heaven, embroidering, Feb. 26
 Hebert, ovens, April 4
 Heginbottom, generating steam, May 2
 Heiffer, razor blades, Oct. 7
 Heilmann, furnaces, June 3
 Hemsley, craped fabrics, Jan. 18
 Hemsley, piled fabrics, Mar. 25
 Henderson, brooms, July 15
 Henderson, stop-cocks, Sept. 19
 Hengel, raising bodies, Nov. 28
 Henley, obtaining spirits, Sept. 19
 Henn, heads of nails, Aug. 22
 Heppleston, finishing yarns, June 3
 Hepplewhite, rudders, Jan. 18
 Herbert, extracting dirt, July 8
 Herbert, lace fabrics, Sept. 5
 Herland, penholder, Nov. 25
 Heron, raising heavy bodies, Nov. 4
 HeronHay, photography, Feb. 8
 Hester, children's chairs, Jan. 12
 Hewitson, castings, April 29
 Hewitson, furnaces, Sept. 5
 Hewitt, pumps, Jan. 4
 Hewitt, pulverizing, Feb. 8
 Heys, spinning, Feb. 15
 Heywood, condensing vapours, Aug. 19
 Heywood, leadholders, Aug. 22
 Heywood, generating steam, Oct. 10
 Heywood, pencil-holders, Nov. 7
 Heywood, lead-holders, Nov. 28
 Heywood, knobs or handles, Dec. 2
 Hick, heating water, Sept. 5
 Hicks, steam engine valve, April 29
 Hicks, stoves, Sept. 26
 Higgin, colouring, Jan. 4
 Hill, furnaces, Feb. 29
 Hill, steam boilers, Aug. 5
 Hill, furnaces, Sept. 26
 Hills, fuel, Mar. 14
 Hills, fatty substances, May 16
 Hills, purifying gas, Aug. 5
 Hinchliffe, spinning wool, July 8
 Hinde, iron, Nov. 28
 Hine, perambulators, May 30
 Hinks, pens and holders, Sept. 5
 Hitt, propelling vessels, May 6
 Hodge, lighting fires, Aug. 29
 Hodges, figured hosiery, Jan. 25
 Hodges, looped fabrics, Aug. 26
 Hodges, textile fabrics, Aug. 26
 Hodges, looped fabrics, Nov. 18
 Hodges, looped fabrics, Dec. 19
 Hodgkinson, bleaching machine, Aug. 15
 Hoffman, fire-arms, Dec. 9
 Hogg, envelopes, Aug. 12
 Hogg, stereotyping, Sept. 30
 Holben, chopping barley, May 30
 Holcroft, spinning cotton, July 25
 Holden, combing wool, Oct. 24
 Holden, roasting-jack, Feb. 29
 Holdin, washing rags, Dec. 5
 Holdin, bleaching apparatus, Dec. 5
 Holdway, carriages, April 4
 Holford, compressing metals, July 31
 Holland, umbrellas, Dec. 2
 Hollingworth, dusting rags, Oct. 7
 Holman, ships' rudders, Dec. 12
 Holmes, driving bands, June 6
 Holmes, electric machines, July 22
 Holmes, fire-places, Dec. 16
 Holt, steam boilers, Nov. 25
 Homan, woven fabrics, April 25
 Homan, sewing machines, Aug. 8
 Homersham, hemp and flax, July 11
 Hoole, stove grates, July 8
 Hooper, carriage springs, July 18
 Hope, engraving, Feb. 5
 Hope, patterns, Mar. 14

- Hopkinson, steam boilers, July 15
 Horner, railway buffers, Aug. 26
 Horsfall, wire rope, Sept. 30
 Horsley, treating quinine, April 4
 Hostage, railway chairs, May 30
 Howard, moulds for castings, May 27
 Howard, valves, Oct. 24
 Howard, tilling machine, Nov. 7
 Howell, corks, Sept. 9
 Hoyos, roasting spits, Jan. 18
 Hubbard, boot soles, April 4
 Hubbard, lighting fires, Oct. 10
 Hubert, ventilating ships, Nov. 7
 Huckvale, hoeing turnips, July 8
 Hudson, stop rods, Jan. 12
 Hudson, weaving looms, Dec. 19
 Hughes, sewing machine, June 10
 Hughes, tool handles, June 10
 Hughes, motive power, June 20
 Huguenin, watches, Mar. 20
 Huillard, textile fabrics, Mar. 25
 Hulse, metallic bedsteads, Aug. 8
 Humaston, telegraphs, May 2
 Humby, cutting machine, Feb. 29
 Humfrey, fatty acids, Feb. 26
 Humfrey, fatty matters, Feb. 26
 Hunt, Hansom cabs, Oct. 17
 Hunt, polishing yarns, Dec. 16
 Hunter, anchors, Sept. 26
 Hurst, railway rails, June 6
 Husband, hats, Sept. 23
 Husband, silk hats, Dec. 5
 Hustler, looms for weaving, Dec. 24
 Hutchinson, rotary motion, April 29
 Hutchinson, cutting figures, June 10
 Hutchinson, oils and fats, Nov. 21
 Hutton, power hammers, Nov. 21
 Hyams, gas meters, Aug. 15
 Hyde, lubricators, Jan. 22
 Hyde mineral oils, Jan. 22
 Hyde, lubricating oil, Feb. 12
 Hyde, purifying alcohol, Feb. 15
 Iles, hair pins, July 25
 Illingworth, printing china, Mar. 18
 Illingworth, glazing china, Nov. 21
 Imray, bending timber, Dec. 24
 Inglis, shaping metals, Dec. 9
 Inshaw, pressure gauge, July 25
 Irlam, roof lamps, April 25
 Jackson, preserving timber, April 29
 Jackson, Venetian blinds, July 15
 Jackson, furnaces, Sept. 12
 Jacot, fire-arms, Sept. 19
 Jacque, musical instruments, Dec. 30
 Jacques Rives, looms, Jan. 25
 James, moulding, Nov. 18
 Jardin, engraving on stone, Oct. 14
 Jarvis, coke kilns, July 4
 Jeacock, knitting machine, Sept. 12
 Jeffree, furnaces, June 10
 Jeffreys, steam boilers, Jan. 8
 Jeffreys, furnaces, April 22
 Jeffreys, respirator, Oct. 17
 Jeffries, cooking stoves, Oct. 10
 Jenkins, fastenings, Dec. 5
 Jennings, bleaching, April 4
 Jennings, valves of pumps, May 23
 Jennings, pipes of baths, May 23
 Jennings, washhand basins, May 23
 Jennings, pumps, July 4
 Jessop, furnaces and boilers, May 2
 Jeune, floor cloth, Aug. 8
 Jobson, railway chairs, May 6
 Jobson, moulds for castings, Sept. 30
 Johns, stereoscopes, Dec. 30
 Johnson, castings, Jan. 4
 Johnson, shaping metals, Jan. 15
 Johnson, sheathing ships, Jan. 22
 Johnson, fire-arms, Jan. 22
 Johnson, railway breaks, Jan. 25
 Johnson, fluid vessels, Feb. 1
 Johnson, prussiates, Mar. 7
 Johnson, air receivers, Mar. 7
 Johnson, gas, Mar. 18.
 Johnston, water gauge, Mar. 20
 Johnson, gas, April 4
 Johnson, watches, April 15
 Johnson, India rubber, April 29
 Johnson, ships' tillers, May 2
 Johnson, fatty matters, May 2
 Johnson, motive power, May 2
 Johnson, weaving, May 20
 Johnson, rising liquids, May 23
 Johnson, piled fabrics, May 30
 Johnson, furnaces, June 3
 Johnson, gas burners, June 6
 Johnson, tyres, June 17
 Johnson, cleansing grain, June 17
 Johnson, steam boilers, June 24
 Johnson, anchors, June 27
 Johnson, musical instruments, June 27
 Johnson, carding engines, July 1
 Johnson, chronometers, July 8
 Johnson, looms, Aug. 8
 Johnson, telegraphs, Aug. 8
 Johnson, cutting coal, Aug. 8
 Johnson, railway breaks, Aug. 12
 Johnson, fountain pens, Aug. 12
 Johnson, cutting forms, Oct. 10
 Johnson, railway rails, Oct. 24
 Johnson, lubricators, Nov. 11
 Johnson, safety paper, Nov. 28
 Johnson, carbonate of barytes, Nov. 28
 Johnson, carding cotton, Dec. 19
 Johnson, circular looms, Dec. 30
 Johnson, consuming smoke, Dec. 30
 Johnson, steam-engines, Dec. 30
 Jones, flatting glass, Feb. 15
 Jones, printing fabrics, Feb. 22
 Jones, elastic fluids, April 11
 Jones, cooking apparatus, Aug. 12
 Jones, motive power, Aug. 22

- Jones, regulating pressure, Sept. 26
 Jong, heating rooms, Sept. 26
 Jonquet, cutting machines, Feb. 19
 Jopling, water meter, Aug. 1
 Joubert, motive power engine, July 29
 Journeaux, drying wheat, Feb. 8
 Juckes, furnaces, Feb. 22
 Juckes, furnace bars, May 27
 Jump, salt manufacturer, Nov. 21
 Kaberry, moulding, Oct. 10
 Kaselowsky, winding machine, Aug. 29
 Kay, woven fabrics, Mar. 4
 Kay, fibrous articles, Aug. 29
 Kay, warping yarns, Sept. 2
 Kay, refining colours, Dec. 24
 Keiller, confectionery, Aug. 29
 Kelk, textile fabrics, Jan. 12
 Keller, carpet bag, Aug. 5
 Kempe, woollen fabrics, Mar. 18
 Kennedy, pump buckets, June 13
 Kent, purifying water, April 11
 Kenworthy, steam engines, April 25
 Kenworthy, self-acting mules, July 29
 Kenyon, printing fabrics, Dec. 19
 Ker, sweeping machine, July 29
 Kerr, spinning, Jan. 8
 Kersey, drain pipes, May 16
 Kershaw, steam boilers, July 8
 Kidman, tiller, or yokes, Feb. 1
 King, printing and embossing, April 29
 Kirkman, twisting cotton, Jan. 25
 Kitson, railway wheels, Sept. 12
 Knight, medical chests, Aug. 8
 Knight, aerating liquids, Nov. 14
 Knighton, portable drill, Feb. 5
 Knoweldon, valves, Dec. 30
 Knowles, metallic pistons, July 8
 Knowles, tuyères, Dec. 5
 Krupp, gun carriages, Mar. 20
 Krupp, railway wheels, Mar. 25
 Kuister, winding machine, June 6
 Kyle, motive power, June 10
 Lackersteen, railway travelling, June 24
 Lacroix, filthing stuffs, Dec. 5
 Lacy, agricultural apparatus, May 20
 Lacy, mail bags, Sept. 5
 Lafond, lighting, Dec. 5
 Lagergreen, paddle-wheels, Feb. 1
 Laing, stretching fabrics, Sept. 5
 Laking, spinning cotton, Sept. 30
 Lalenran, combing flax, Dec. 30
 Lamb, iron ships, July 15
 Lambert, regulating water, May 23
 Laming, purifying gas, Aug. 19
 Lancaster, furnaces, Jan. 12
 Lancaster, waterproofing, Mar. 25
 Lancaster, generating heat, July 18
 Lancaster, inking apparatus, Sept. 26
 Lane, gold-leaf, Jan. 15
 Lange, ovens, Mar. 4
 Laporte, candles, Feb. 15
 Laporte, bougies, July 18
 Larmuth, printing machine, Feb. 29
 Last, portmanteaus, Aug. 12
 Latour, shoe nails, Feb. 1
 Law, ships' slips, July 15
 Lawrence, shirt collars, Oct. 24
 Lawrence, gun barrels, Nov. 11
 Lawrie, steam engines, Jan. 12
 Lawrie, ship building, Feb. 29
 Lawrie, steam engines, Oct. 17
 Lawson, reeling machines, May 6
 Laxton, gearing, April 29
 Laxton, fire-arms, May 9
 Laxton, circular saws, Oct. 7
 Lea, taps and cocks, April 25
 Leach, spinning apparatus, May 20
 Leach, carding wool engine, Dec. 12
 Lebaigne, chocolate, Mar. 4
 Leck, textile fabrics, Aug. 5
 Leech, preparing wool, Nov. 7
 Lees, weaving looms, Mar. 18
 Lees, spinning machine, June 24
 Leigh, sizing fabrics, Sept. 30
 Leighton, paddle-wheels, June 3
 Lenny, carriages, April 18
 Lenny, carriages, June 3
 Lepage, artificial wood, Mar. 14
 Leroux, fatty bodies, Jan. 12
 Leroy, railway carriages, Jan. 18
 Levavasseur, oil lamps, Jan. 12
 Loverson, tackle block, Sept. 19
 Levy, wearing apparel, Mar. 4
 Lewis, gloves, Feb. 1
 Lewis, screw propellers, Sept. 26
 Lewtas, raising weights, Mar. 11
 Lewtas, holding chains, Sept. 19
 Lillie, fire-arms, June 20
 Linder, fire-arms, Dec. 12
 Lindsay, tubular flues, Oct. 10
 Lister, combing wool, Jan. 12
 Lister, spinning, Feb. 12
 Lister, treating waste silk, Feb. 12
 Lister, weaving, Feb. 15
 Lister, combing wool, May 23
 Lister, spinning, Sept. 30
 Lister, weaving, Sept. 30
 Little, lamps, June 24
 Lloyd, washing minerals, Oct. 17
 Lobstein, sewing machines, May 16
 Locke, fog signals, April 22
 Lodge, furnaces, May 6
 Lomax, steam engine, Mar. 14
 Longbottom, fatty matters, Mar. 11
 Longridge, motive power, Dec. 19
 Longridge, ploughing, Dec. 30
 Longsdon, fire safe, Feb. 1
 Looker, indicators, June 6
 Lopez, anti-bilious powder, Jan. 25
 Lord, preparing cotton, Dec. 30
 Loveridge, baths, April 18
 Lowe, propellers, April 1

- Lowe, knitting machine, Sept. 23
 Lownds, pencil case, Feb. 22
 Lowry, heckling flax, Mar. 4
 Lozano, treating pyrites, Jan. 18
 Lucas, alimentary substances, Nov. 28
 Ludbrook, railway wheels, Feb. 12
 Lund, pencil cases, Mar. 25
 Lurig, saltpetre, Sept. 30
 Lyall, spinning machines, Mar. 14
 Lyall, carriages, May 27
 Lynn, propelling vessels, Aug. 19
 Macdonald, printing fabrics, Dec. 5
 Macintosh, projectiles, Dec. 19
 Mackelcan, calico rollers, Dec. 2
 Maclure, printing presses, June 3
 Maddison, telegraphs, Sept. 30
 Maggs, dressing flour, April 25
 Maggs, thrashing machine, Sept. 5
 Magnus, coke, Oct. 17
 Maissait, projectiles, Aug. 15
 Makin, embossing fabrics, Sept. 26
 Malteste, shirts, July 11
 Manceaux, fire-arms, June 20
 Manery, cast steel, Sept. 26
 Manning, sewerage, Feb. 5
 Mannix, locomotive power, Dec. 12
 Mapple, barometers, Oct. 21
 March, propellers, Oct. 10
 Marchinton, vices, Mar. 4
 Marcus, furnaces, Aug. 26
 Mardon, garaucine, Jan. 8
 Margueritte, vitreous products, May 6
 Margueritte, salts, May 23
 Marland, power looms, June 6
 Marrais, railway signals, Dec. 19
 Marsden, sewers and mines, June 27
 Marsden, cleansing land, Nov. 11
 Marsh, looped fabrics, May 30
 Marsh, fire-grates, Sept. 26
 Martien, oxides of iron, Feb. 15
 Martien, metallic substances, Mar. 4
 Martien, iron and steel, Mar. 11
 Martien, iron and steel, April 4
 Martien, iron, Sept. 26
 Martin, pulp, Jan. 4
 Martin, portable crates, Mar. 18
 Martin, incubator, May 23
 Martin, drying wheat, Nov. 4
 Martineau, taps and cocks, Dec. 19
 Marychurch, horse rakes, Nov. 7
 Mash, steam-engines, July 25
 Mash, furnaces, Oct. 10
 Massager-Abit, fibrous substances, Dec. 16
 Massey, weaving looms, Dec. 9
 Massip, hat linings, April 1
 Mather, steam gauges, June 20
 Mauban, oil cans, Nov. 28
 Maugham, starch, July 8
 Maugham, fire-proof wood, Nov. 14
 Maxwell, taps, Aug. 15
 May, spikes and trennails, March 14.
 May, combing wool, June 24
 Mayall, photography, Jan. 8
 Mayer, photography, July 11
 Maynard, cutting machine, Aug. 26
 Maynes, weaving, Feb. 12
 M'Adam, plastic substances, Dec. 19
 M'Bride, scutching flax, Sept. 26
 M'Callum, telegraphs, Mar. 20
 M'Cloy, spinning, Nov. 11
 M'Connell, locomotive engines, Aug. 15
 M'Dougall, treating bones, July 29
 M'Dowall, sawing wood, Dec. 16
 M'Evoy, locks and latches, July 11
 M'Farlane, metal fittings, May 23
 M'Glashan, printing press, April 18
 M'Gregor, throstles, Sept. 30
 M'Intyre, caulking, Feb. 1
 M'Lean, textile fabrics, May 23
 Meacock, gas meters, July 8
 Mege, bread, Dec. 5
 Meillet, artificial stone, Oct. 7
 Meldrum, salts of sodium, Jan. 8
 Mellor, self-acting mules, Jan. 18
 Mellor, steam boilers, Feb. 1
 Mellor, steam boilers, Oct. 7
 Merrett, trowsers and drawers, May 6
 Messenger, boilers, Aug. 15
 Mesure, watches, June 20
 Meyer, morticing, Nov. 14
 Mickle, smelting, Jan. 15
 Middleton, spinning machine, Mar. 20
 Midgley, preparing yarns, June 6
 Miller, ventilators, July 22
 Miller, propelling vessels, Dec. 19
 Miller, furnaces, Dec. 19
 Mills, cutting machines, June 17
 Mills, steam engines, Aug. 12
 Mills, pianofortes, Dec. 19
 Millward, screw-key, Dec. 19
 Milner, bedsteads, April 25
 Mirimonde, axles, Dec. 30
 Mitchell, buffers, Feb. 22
 Mitchell, sewing machines, Aug. 8
 Mitchell, washing ores, Sept. 12
 Moate, rails of railways, May 27
 Moffat, metallic spoons, June 3
 Molesworth, child's cot, Sept. 30
 Moll, disinfectors, Aug. 15
 Moore, corn mill, April 4
 Moore, finishing lace, Sept. 26
 More, compasses, Feb. 29
 Morel, fibrous materials, Feb. 19
 Morel, steam-engines, Oct. 7
 Morewood, coating iron, June 24
 Morgan, fuel for furnaces, May 30
 Morgan, cellular purse, Sept. 17
 Morgan, guns and mortars, Sept. 26
 Moriarty, tube brushes, Dec. 24
 Morin, artificial fuel, Jan. 15
 Morrell, railway chairs, June 17
 Morris, raising weights, Sept. 12

Morris, beetle traps, Nov. 21
 Morrison, fodder, Feb. 8
 Morrison, cast iron, Mar. 4
 Morrison, pile-driving machine, Sept. 5
 Morrison, fastenings, Nov. 14
 Morrison, cast iron, Nov. 28
 Morrison, metallic bedsteads, Nov. 28
 Morrison, penholder, Nov. 28
 Morton, paint, June 17
 Morton, paper-hangings, June 17
 Mosley, woven fabrics, May 30
 Mourguet, insect destroyer, Jan. 29
 Moutrie, piano-fortes, Aug. 8
 Mowbray, spinning apparatus, May 6
 Muir, weaving looms, Aug. 8
 Muir, slide lathes, Aug. 19
 Muir, sizing machine, Dec. 16
 Munslow, railways, May 16
 Muratori, waterproofing, July 29
 Murdoch, sewing apparatus, May 6
 Murdoch, cut velvets, Aug. 19
 Murdock, chain-stitch, April 18
 Murphy, stopping carriages, Sept. 19
 Murray, carriage wheels, June 6
 Muschamp, waterproof water, Sept. 12
 Musgrave, stoves, April 1
 Mushet, iron and steel, Dec. 24
 Mushet, iron, Dec. 30
 Musto, tobacco machine, Mar. 20
 Nairne, preparing flax, Nov. 24
 Nalder, winnowing, Jan. 4
 Napier, air flues, July 22
 Napier, propellers, Aug. 5
 Nasmith, tiles and bricks, July 25
 Nasmyth, motive power, Mar. 20
 Nasmyth, tin plates, Nov. 14
 Naylor, hammers, April 18
 Naylor, power hammers, Sept. 26
 Needham, expressing liquors, July 22
 Negretti, thermometers, April 8
 Neild, pattern looms, Dec. 24
 Neilson, locomotive engines, June 27
 Neilson, finishing yarns, Nov. 18
 Nelot, penholders, Sept. 9
 Nettleship, spinning, Mar. 4
 Neuburger, extracting oil, Aug. 1
 Neuenschwander, Swiss whey, June 6
 Newall, telegraphs, Sept. 19
 Newington, destroying insects, Nov. 25
 Newman, axles, Jan. 8
 Newman, fire lighter, Feb. 19
 Newman, fastenings, June 10
 Newton, castings, Jan. 8
 Newton, condensers, Jan. 8
 Newton, drying flour, Jan. 22
 Newton, railroad chairs, Jan. 25
 Newton, fire-arms, Feb. 12
 Newton, hats, Feb. 22
 Newton, bolts, Feb. 22
 Newton, gas, Feb. 29
 Newton, cannon, Feb. 29

Newton, locks, Mar. 14
 Newton, rope-making machine, Mar. 14
 Newton, curing meats, Mar. 18
 Newton, rods and shafts, Mar. 25
 Newton, cannon, April 1
 Newton, electrotypes, April 1
 Newton, fire-arms, April 1
 Newton, copying machine, April 18
 Newton, taps and cocks, April 25
 Newton, steam-engines, April 29
 Newton, railway carriage springs, April 29
 Newton, zinc manufacture, April 29
 Newton, separating metals, May 20
 Newton, air-engine, May 30
 Newton, diving apparatus, May 30
 Newton, dressing cloth, May 30
 Newton, tanning, June 10
 Newton, furnaces, June 17
 Newton, steam, June 20
 Newton, fire-arms, June 27
 Newton, envelopes, July 22
 Newton, boat tackle, July 25
 Newton, gradients' apparatus, July 29
 Newton, boots and shoes, Aug. 5
 Newton, rotary pump, Aug. 5
 Newton, fire-arms, Aug. 5
 Newton, cranes, Aug. 8
 Newton, clearing railroads, Aug. 8
 Newton, printing machinery, Aug. 12
 Newton, punching machine, Aug. 15
 Newton, reaping machines, Aug. 22
 Newton, separating substances, Aug. 26
 Newton, air-engines, Aug. 26
 Newton, distillation, Aug. 29
 Newton, polishing glass, Sept. 5
 Newton, phosphoric acid, Sept. 16
 Newton, folding paper, Sept. 23
 Newton, forging nails, Sept. 26
 Newton, packing goods, Sept. 26
 Newton, projectiles, Sept. 26
 Newton, rotary engines, Sept. 26
 Newton, soldering iron, Sept. 30
 Newton, grate bars, Sept. 30
 Newton, oil from seeds, Sept. 30
 Newton, enamelled cloth, Oct. 3
 Newton, taking altitudes, Oct. 3
 Newton, plastering, Oct. 7
 Newton, rotary motion, Oct. 7
 Newton, felting hats, Oct. 10
 Newton, raising vessels, Oct. 14
 Newton, purified oil, Oct. 17
 Newton, splitting wood, Oct. 17
 Newton, coal gas, Oct. 21
 Newton, forcing pump, Oct. 21
 Newton, rotary pump, Oct. 21
 Newton, sun's altitude, Oct. 24
 Newton, chloride of aluminium, Nov. 4
 Newton, musical instrument, Nov. 4
 Newton, raising water, Nov. 11
 Newton, fire-arms, Dec. 2
 Newton, fire-arms, Dec. 2

- Newton, fountain pen, Dec. 5
 Newton, shot pouches, Dec. 9
 Newton, sewing machine, Dec. 9
 Newton, rope and cordage, Dec. 16
 Newton, Indian-rubber cutter, Dec. 16
 Newton, piled fabrics, Dec. 16
 Newton, reefing sails, Dec. 19
 Newton, reaping machine, Dec. 24
 Newton, generating gas, Dec. 30
 Nickels, piled fabrics, Mar. 25
 Nickels, weaving machine, June 20
 Nicoll, fireplaces, Mar. 11
 Nicoulland, furnaces, July 11
 Nimmo, textile fabrics, Sept. 23
 Norbury, hydraulic presses, Mar. 18
 Normand, steam engines, Sept. 5
 Normand, furnaces, Sept. 5
 Normandy, weaving machine, Jan. 8
 Normandy, railways, Feb. 8
 Normandy, railway rails, July 29
 Normandy, printing music, Oct. 7
 Norris, boots and shoes, July 22
 Norris, cutting tools, Aug. 8
 Norris, anchors, Nov. 14
 North, wheel carriages, May 27
 North, pistons, June 24
 Norton, weaving, Feb. 22
 Nottidge, manure, Jan. 8
 Nuun, tables, June 3
 Obissier, motive power, Jan. 12
 Ochs, paper from leather, June 6
 Oddie, weaving looms, April 8.
 Oldfield, self-acting mules, Aug. 12
 Oldham, colouring cement, Nov. 4
 Olive, railway wheels, Mar. 18
 Oliver, silk waste, Nov. 11
 Oppenheimer, piled fabrics, Sept. 2
 Orange, covering yarns, Feb. 19
 O'Regan, boilers, April 11
 Ormerod, cleaning fabrics, Dec. 16
 Osbourn, smoothing machine, May 2
 Oudry, preserving metals, April 11
 Owen, railway wheels, May 20
 Owen, fireplaces, May 27
 Owen, pianofortes, June 10
 Owen, artificial, Nov. 25
 Page, shaping metals, Jan. 25
 Page, fixing colours in stone, May 2
 Page, decorating glass, Nov. 18
 Paget, looped fabrics, May 27
 Palmer, reaping machine, Feb. 12
 Palmer, pumps, Sept. 12
 Palmieri, ship building, Feb. 1
 Panet, propellers, Feb. 15
 Papineau, spirits of wine, Sept. 26
 Parant, millstones, April 18
 Parkes, waterproofing, Jan. 25
 Parkhurst, sails and rigging, July 29
 Parkhurst, paddle-wheels, Nov. 25
 Parkinson, railway breaks, Mar. 11
 Parnell, locks, July 22
 Parry, puddling iron, July 25
 Parsons, joining pipes, Feb. 8
 Parsons, locomotive engines, June 10
 Parsons, bleaching, Aug. 29
 Parsons railway ways, Dec. 9
 Parsons, washing fabrics, Dec. 16
 Partridge, malt crushers, Mar. 11
 Pascal, motive power, Jan. 8
 Patterson, grinding machine, April 29
 Pattison, dressing machine, Jan. 22
 Pearce, generating steam, July 18
 Percy, twisting cotton, Sept. 9
 Pedros, motive power, Oct. 3
 Pegg, steering apparatus, July 8
 Pemberton, organs, Nov. 18
 Pendlebury, textile fabrics, Sept. 26
 Penrice, boring rocks, Sept. 26
 Perinaud, dressing silks, Oct. 21
 Perkins, warming apparatus, June 3
 Perkins, generating steam, June 3
 Perreaux, valves, Aug. 5
 Perring, railway chairs, Oct. 21
 Pettit, gas stoves, June 24
 Petitjean, gilding glass, Jan. 12
 Petitperre, sawing stone, Aug. 29
 Petrie, filters, Dec. 19
 Peyton, bedsteads, April 18
 Pfaltz, soap from rosin, Dec. 24
 Pfeiffer, knives, Mar. 18
 Pickering, railway ways, July 18
 Pierres-Samain, tables and stools, July 4
 Pietroni, printing on cloth, Dec. 2
 Pilling, yarns or threads, Oct. 21
 Pimont, metallic pens, Aug. 26
 Pinches, dies, April 22
 Pinches, embossing machine, April 29
 Pitman, screw wrench, Mar. 20
 Pitman, fire-arms, April 15
 Pitman, fire-arms, Nov. 28
 Pitman, telegraphs, Dec. 16
 Pitt, cornice poles, Feb. 1
 Pitt, brackets and casters, Sept. 5
 Pittar, bridges, Jan. 8
 Planque, fecula, Aug. 15
 Platt, spinning, Feb. 5
 Platt, brick-making, April 22
 Platt, twining yarns, July 8
 Platt, bricks, Oct. 24
 Plunkett, textile fabrics, June 5
 Pochin, chemicals, May 16
 Pockson, roofing, July 15
 Poignand, wedges, Mar. 14
 Poitevin, printing, April 25
 Poitevin, dress fastenings, April 25
 Poitevin, engraving, April 25
 Poitiers, brooms and brushes, Sept. 26
 Pole, railway wheels, May 2
 Poliesse, encaustic matters, Jan. 8
 Pollak, soap, June 17
 Pollitt, churning milk, Mar. 18
 Poncelin, treating coffee, Jan. 18

- Pontefix, tartaric acid, Aug. 20
 Pontonerie, smoke consumer, Nov. 4
 Poole, steam engines, May 20
 Pope, metals, July 8
 Pope, steam power, Sept. 19
 Porteous, gas regulator, Feb. 15
 Porteous, rotatory engine, Mar. 11
 Porter, weaving looms, Aug. 29
 Portus, carriages, Nov. 18
 Potts, sepulchral monuments, Nov. 25
 Pouillet, railways, Feb. 15
 Poulson, steam engine, Feb. 8
 Pradel, twisting fabrics, Jan. 25
 Prangley, music, April 8
 Pratt, steam mills, Jan. 10
 Pratt, brushes, May 16
 Pratt, motive power, Sept. 19
 Préaud, India-rubber springs, June 10
 Prestage, locomotives, April 15
 Preston, shaping metal, July 8
 Preston, paper hangings, Dec. 30
 Preux, warming carriages, Nov. 28
 Price, fire-proof safes, Feb. 1
 Price, cast iron, May 16
 Price, cast steel, May 16
 Price, boilers, June 17
 Prideaux, furnaces, Feb. 29
 Priestly, pianofortes, June 20
 Prince, moulds for casting, Oct. 8
 Proller, preparing skins, Dec. 16
 Pryse, fire-arms, Feb. 15
 Pugh, alarum, Mar. 25
 Puls, electric light, May 16
 Puls, galvanic batteries, Sept. 23
 Pycock, curtain fixtures, Feb. 8
 Pye, preparing silk, Sept. 26
 Radcliffe, dampers, Jan. 15
 Radcliffe, cutting sugar, May 27
 Radley, treating minerals, Aug. 8
 Ramie, railway ways, Sept. 26
 Rammell, black-lead, April 18
 Rammell, pen-holders, Oct. 17
 Ramsbottom, measuring, May 23
 Ramsbotham, combing wool, Aug. 5
 Ramscar, fire-arms, Feb. 19
 Raudolph, marine engines, May 20
 Ransome, artificial stone, Nov. 24
 Rascol, dress fastenings, Mar. 7
 Rascol, type, April 22
 Rassant, circular motion, Oct. 14
 Ratcliffe, dampers, Mar. 4
 Raywood, sowing machine, April 22
 Reading, watch-keys, Aug. 29
 Rechten, fishing, July 8
 Reckitt, starch, April 25
 Redfern, skates, June 24
 Redmayne, stove grates, Jan. 12
 Reed, medicine, Dec. 16
 Rees, ornamenting glass, Sept. 9
 Reeves, fire-arms, Jan. 15
 Regazzoli, propellers, Jan. 15
 Render, lubricator, July 29
 RenePean, inkstands, April 1
 Rennie, boilers, April 1
 Restell, fire-arms, July 29
 Restell, doors, Oct. 14
 Rice, waterproof cloth, Feb. 15
 Rice, boots and shoes, Feb. 15
 Rice, guns and rifles, Sept. 12
 Richard, sugar, July, 11
 Richards, leather, Jan. 18
 Richards, fire-arms, Jan. 25
 Richardson, clay wares, Jan. 18
 Richardson, chenille fabrics, Jan. 22
 Richardson, buffer springs, May 2
 Richardson, steam engines, Sept. 9
 Richardson, railway switches, Oct. 10
 Rickett, pressure gauges, Feb. 15
 Ridal, knife handles, July 29
 Riddle, tanning, Nov. 4
 Rigby, grinding machine, Sept. 26
 Riley, roller mill, April 22
 Riley, cooling worts, Dec. 19
 Rippon, printing fabrics, Sept. 19
 Roberts, starch, April 15
 Roberts, tobacco, May 20
 Roberts, pumps, Sept. 9
 Roberts, omnibuses, Sept. 30
 Roberts, bricks and tiles, Nov. 14
 Robertson, reaping machine, April 29
 Robertson, mariners' compass, May 6
 Robertson, motive power, Sept. 9
 Robertson, inkstand, Sept. 26
 Robertson, weaving, Oct. 14
 Robertson, spinning machine, Dec. 30
 Robey, boilers, Feb. 26
 Robinson, clocks, Jan. 8
 Robinson, paper cutter, Jan. 12
 Robinson, drying wheat, Feb. 8
 Robinson, steam engines, June 6
 Robinson, printing, July 18
 Robinson, gardening machine, Nov. 14
 Robson, water-closets, Mar. 7
 Rock, carriages, Sept. 5
 Roffe, stoves and furnaces, April 1
 Rogers, fire-arms, Jan. 25
 Rogers, safety doors, Feb. 8
 Rogers, cooking, Dec. 12
 Rollet, projectiles, Jan. 22
 Rooke, stair rods, July 15
 Rose, printing presses, Feb. 29
 Rosenberg, metallic surfaces, May 27
 Rosenberg, ornamenting china, Aug. 29
 Ross, bolts and rivets, June 10
 Rothera, bolts, Mar. 18
 Rothwell, self-acting mules, July 18
 Routledge, steam engine, July 8
 Rowan, steam engines, April 29
 Rowcliffe, paving, June 3
 Rowley, elastic bands, Feb. 15
 Rowley, shaping iron, June 24
 Roy, chimneys, Nov. 7

- Royds, soap, Oct. 21
 Rualem, fuel, May 23
 Ruck, tanning hides, Sept. 26
 Ruck, paper, Dec. 5
 Ruding, printing silks, June 3
 Russell, cast steel tubes, Dec. 2
 Ruston, anchors, June 6
 Ryder, steam engines, Sept. 5
 Ryland, bracelets, April 1
 Sadler, hinges, Dec. 2
 Saffroy, railway breaks, May 30
 Salamon, coal gas, June 10
 Sampson, finishing fabrics, Dec. 24
 Samuel, combs, July 18
 Samuel steam engines, Sept. 23
 Samuels, weaving fabrics, Aug. 8
 Samuelson, screw propellers, Aug. 29
 Sanders, meters and boilers, Jan. 25
 Sanders, ornamental floor, Dec. 30
 Sanderson, iron, April 11
 Sands, railway chairs, Mar. 25
 Sangster, stays and corsets, Mar. 4
 Sangster, corsets, June 13
 Sangster, umbrellas, Aug. 22
 Saunders, rollers, Jan. 12
 Sautelet, cloth, Feb. 8
 Sautelet, tanning, May 27
 Savage, drilling machine, June 24
 Sawyer, bomb shell, Mar. 4
 Saxby, railway signals, Dec. 19
 Scariano, measuring apparatus, Dec. 16
 Schaeffer, treating soap-suds
 Schafer, gumming apparatus, Aug. 15
 Schelhorn, penholder, Aug. 15
 Scheurmann, printing music, Nov. 24
 Schiele, motive power, Jan. 22
 Schischkar, dying, April 18
 Schischkar, cleansing silks, April 29
 Schlickeysen, bricks, &c., Feb. 5
 Schloss, travelling bags, May 2
 Schloss, pistol bolt, May 23
 Scholefield, paper cutter, May 2
 Schranm, cotton seed oil, Feb. 26
 Schratz, preparing colours, Oct. 24
 Schwartz, treating, Mar. 4
 Schwartz, bricks, Dec. 19
 Schwartzkopff, cleansing rivers, April 18
 Scott, corking bottles, Jan. 15
 Scott, piled fabrics, May 20
 Scott, fastenings, Aug. 26
 Scott, cement, Oct. 14
 Scott, metal fittings, Oct. 17
 Scott, carriages, Nov. 14
 Scott, washing wool, Nov. 28
 Scott, cooking, Dec. 5
 Scully, locks and keys, Jan. 12
 Scully, cocks and taps, Jan. 15
 Scully, preserving, Jan. 22
 Scully, paper clip, Mar. 25
 Scully, inkstands, July 8
 Seed, lap machine, Dec. 12
 Seithen, cork cutting, Jan. 8
 Sellers, weighing grain, Mar. 18
 Seymour, furnaces, Sept. 26
 Shanks, indicators, June 17
 Shanks, cutting screws, July 1
 Shanks, water gauges, July 22
 Shanks, cutting metals, Dec. 9
 Sharp, drilling machine, April 1
 Sharp, winding silk, April 22
 Sharpe, water closets, Feb. 22
 Sharpley, propellers, Dec. 2
 Shaw, railways, May 16
 Shaw, gas burner, Oct. 3
 Shaw, spinning cotton, Oct. 10
 Shaw, weaving, Oct. 14
 Shaw, food for cattle, Nov. 24
 Shears, stereoscope, Feb. 12
 Shears, magazines, Mar. 25
 Sheppard, stop cocks, June 20
 Shirreff, rotatory engines, July 29
 Short, horseshoes, Sept. 23
 Siehel, weaving apparatus, Aug. 15
 Siemen's steam-engines, Sept. 26
 Simmons, hat body, Mar. 11
 Simpson, combing wool, Aug. 8
 Simpson, knife cleaner, Nov. 7
 Simpson, lubricating oil, Nov. 14
 Sinclair, railway chairs, Aug. 22
 Skaife, photographic pictures, Aug. 26
 Skinner, figuring metals, April 25
 Slaughter, fire boxes, April 18
 Sleigh, motive power, July 8
 Sleight, medicine, Feb. 8
 Sloper, refrigerator, Dec. 19
 Small, compasses, Mar. 11
 Smith, steel wire, Jan. 15
 Smith, horse rake, Jan. 18
 Smith, perambulators, Feb. 26
 Smith, smoke consumer, Feb. 26
 Smith, carriage break, Mar. 14
 Smith, alarm signals, Mar. 14
 Smith, bedsteads, April 1
 Smith, sewing machine, April 18
 Smith, chemicals, April 25
 Smith, ploughs, April 29
 Smith, gas regulators, May 16
 Smith, steel wire, July 25
 Smith, windlasses, Aug. 15
 Smith, casing horizontal shafts, Aug. 20
 Smith, water gauges, Aug. 22
 Smith, horse rakes, Sept. 26
 Smith, lubricators, Sept. 26
 Smith, finishing fabrics, Oct. 21
 Smith, crushing roller, Oct. 21
 Smith, treating fibres, Oct. 24
 Smith, furnaces, Nov. 4
 Smith, locomotive engines, Dec. 9
 Smith, harrows, Dec. 19
 Soelman, propellers, Feb. 8
 Somerville, weaving, Nov. 28
 Southby, coating iron, July 4

- Speed, springs, April 25
 Spence, carding cotton, Feb. 5
 Spence, chemicals, April 11
 Spence, steam-engines, Dec. 9
 Spencer, card surfaces, July 22
 Spencer, rails for railways, Aug. 29
 Spiller, chamber lamps, Nov. 7
 Spilsbury, paints, Feb. 8
 Spilsbury, soda and alum, Dec. 19
 Spittle, braiding machine, Dec. 12
 Spurrier, metallic teapots, May 6
 Squire, manure, Oct. 21
 Squires, pipes and tubes, July 15
 Stamm, presses for packing, Aug. 22
 Stanley, weighbridges, Feb. 1
 Stansbury, shirts, Feb. 19
 Stansbury, grinding mill, Feb. 22
 Stansbury, locks, Feb. 29
 Stansbury, ships' regulator, Oct. 17
 Stark, writing pens, April 22
 Statham, telegraphs, Jan. 15
 Statham, cables, Mar. 20
 Statham, telegraphs, July 1
 Stanfen, stuffing cushions, May 2
 Steedman, piano-fortes, Aug. 15
 Steiner, drying fabrics, Aug. 8
 Stenhouse, decolourising, Jan. 18
 Stenhouse, decolourising, Sept. 12
 Stent, measuring fluids, Jan. 22
 Steven, kitchen ranges, May 27
 Stevens, steam boilers, Jan. 25
 Stevens, steam apparatus, July 29
 Stevenson, soda, Mar. 25
 Stevenson, carding machine, June 20
 Stewart, steam boilers, Feb. 26
 Stewart, shaping metals, May 2
 Stewart, polishing machine, June 10
 Stewart, cutting stone, Dec. 30
 Stirling, cylinders, April 4
 Stirling, coating metals, April 4
 Stirling, steel, Sept. 12
 Stocker, water-closets, Jan. 15
 Stocker, ink-stands, Oct. 24
 Stocqueler, elevations, Jan. 25
 Stopporton, propellers, Sept. 26
 Stott, carbonate of soda, May 23
 Strafford, signal lamps, July 22
 Strang, weaving, May 23
 Striby, musical notation, Jan. 12
 Stuart, time pieces, June 27
 Sturge, rotary meter, Sept. 9
 Sturly, breakfast mixture, Sept. 30
 Swan, writing ink, May 30
 Swift, carriage wheels, April 15
 Swinburne, furnaces, Mar. 25
 Swinburne, furnaces, April 1
 Symonds, gold refining, Oct. 14
 Symons, roasting-jack, May 20
 Symons, railways, May 23
 Symons, alarums, Oct. 7
 Symons, heat indicator, Oct. 7
 Tabourin, metallic arch, Jan. 4
 Tall, blind rollers, June 6
 Tatham, spinning machine, Mar. 20
 Tayler, paddle-wheels, May 23
 Taylor, iron, Jan. 22
 Taylor, fire engine, April 15
 Taylor, constructing walls, Aug. 8
 Taylor, generating gases, Aug. 22
 Taylor, iron and steel, Nov. 21
 Terry, fire-arms, Sept. 19
 Thatcher, spinning cotton, Dec. 5
 Therey, coffee, Mar. 4
 Thibierge, chlorine, April 1
 Thierry, hygienic apparatus, July 4
 Thistlethwaite, photography, Nov. 14
 Thomas, soap, Jan. 25
 Thomas, projectiles, Feb. 19
 Thomas, hardening steel, April 11
 Thomas, coating metals, May 16
 Thomas, sewing machines, July 8
 Thompson, ships' keelsons, July 15
 Thompson, drawing instruments, Aug. 5
 Thompson, printing, Aug. 5
 Thompson, skates, Aug. 12
 Thompson, weaving, Sept. 12
 Thompson, haymaking machine, Oct. 14
 Thomson, steam engines, April 8
 Thornton, looped fabrics, Jan. 18
 Thornton, piled fabrics, Feb. 12
 Threlfall, sizing, Jan. 4
 Tieffe-Lacroix, cutting files, July 4
 Tileston, ruling paper, Feb. 1
 Tilghman, alkalies, Jan. 15
 Tilghman, fatty matters, Jan. 15
 Tilghman, iron, Mar. 4
 Tillett, bedsteads, Dec. 19
 Todd, balance pen, June 10
 Tolhausen, metallic chains, Jan. 22
 Tolhausen, projectiles, April 18
 Tolhausen, harvest machine, June 3
 Tolhausen, axle boxes, June 3
 Tolhausen, compasses, June 3
 Tolhausen, pumps, June 6
 Tolhausen, steam engines, July 1
 Tolhausen, yarn, July 15
 Tolhausen, boring machine, July 15
 Tolhausen, railway rails, July 18
 Tolhausen, wood cutting, July 29
 Tolhausen, carding machine, July 29
 Tolhausen, earthenware, Sept. 5
 Tolhausen, watches, Sept. 5
 Tolhausen, ovens, Sept. 5
 Tolhausen, chemical writing, Sept. 5
 Tolhausen, clock-work, Nov. 18
 Tolhausen, pocket umbrellas, Dec. 30
 Tolson, yarns and fabrics, June 6
 Tomlinson, waterproofing, Jan. 8
 Tomlinson, medical plaister, June 20
 Tooth, earthenware, Jan. 1
 Topham, incrustation, Feb. 8
 Topham, cleansing boilers, Oct. 24

- Torassa, motive power, Nov. 18
 Toucas, metallic alloy, Aug. 1
 Townsend, knitted fabrics, Nov. 11
 Toye, weaving terry fabrics, May 27
 Tranter, fire-arms, Dec. 5
 Treeby, fire-arms, Jan. 10
 Tremeschini, telegraphs, July 11
 Tritton, balconies, April 22
 Truelove, gloves, June 17
 Trueman, ovens, Aug. 29
 Trueman, treating regulus, Sept. 9
 Truman, artificial teeth, Mar. 25
 Truman, artificial teeth, May 20
 Truran, smelting, Jan. 18
 Tuck, condensers, Jan. 12
 Tuck, blowing apparatus, Jan. 15
 Tuck, dredging machine, Mar. 7
 Tuck, submarine apparatus, Mar. 11
 Tucker, sacking, Aug. 8
 Tucker, locks and latches, Sept. 26
 Tuckey, motive power, May 23
 Turletti, alarums, Jan. 15
 Turner, elastic fabrics, Mar. 20
 Turner, loop fabrics, June 27
 Turner, elastic tubing, Aug. 26
 Turner, cutting hydes, Dec. 30
 Turton, buffer springs, June 17
 Tyler, telegraphs, May 30
 Tyerman, omnibuses, April 29
 Tylor, bedsteads, July 4
 Tysoe, spinning cotton, Sept. 23
 Tytherleigh, coating iron, June 24
 Uchatius, cast steel, Feb. 22
 Ullner, paper cutter, Jan. 22
 Ulrich, chronometers, July 11
 Underhay, drawing off water, July 8
 Underhill, life-preserver, Nov. 4
 Unwin, penknives, Dec. 12
 Uttley, steam boilers, June 17
 Van Den Bergh, packing, Feb. 19
 Vann, polishing metals, Nov. 4
 Venables, plastic articles, Aug. 22
 Verel, grinding horn, April 11
 Vermeersch, weaving, Jan. 8
 Vignat, ribbon weaving, Aug. 5
 Villeroix, soap, April 29
 Vimont, spinning wool, Sept. 30
 Vivian, gold and silver ore, Sept. 19
 Wadsworth, ventilation, Nov. 28
 Wagstaff, garments, April, 18
 Wakefield, screw blanks, April 4
 Wakefield, steam engine valve, April 29
 Walenn, flattening glass, Jan. 8
 Walenn, gates, April 11
 Walenn, looms, April 22
 Walenn, piano-fortes, May 1
 Walker, raising coals, June 3
 Walker, safety valves, July 22
 Walker, hay-cutting machine, Aug. 15
 Walker, playing cards, Aug. 22
 Walker, steam regulators, Oct. 17
 Walker, trimming vessels, Dec. 2
 Wallace, bleaching, Mar. 14
 Wallace, bleaching, April 25
 Wallace, textile fabrics, July 8
 Wallace, treating tobacco, Aug. 12
 Wallace, wheels, Nov. 24
 Waller, preparing cotton, July 25
 Waller, cheese, Sept. 12
 Walton, paper mâché, Mar. 18
 Walton, cleaning forks, June 24
 Warburton, combing wool, May 6
 Ward, looms for weaving, May 16
 Ward, omnibus, July 22
 Ward, lubricators, Sept. 12
 Warren, vices, Mar. 4
 Warren, shaping glass, May 27
 Warren, shaping glass, May 27
 Warren envelopes, June 24
 Washington, sweeping flues, Jan. 22
 Watkins, infusions, Nov. 11
 Watson, ladies' dress, Feb. 29
 Watson, bottles and flasks, Nov. 4
 Watson, spinning material, Nov. 18
 Watson, cocks and valves, Dec. 16
 Watt, coating iron with zinc, May 20
 Webb, door knob spindles, Mar. 20
 Webb, chairs, Nov. 14
 Webber, generating steam, Sept. 19
 Webster, chronometers, Mar. 4
 Webster, metallic tube, Sept. 30
 Webster, pumps, Nov. 4
 Webster, feeding trough, Nov. 4
 Webster, valve cock, Nov. 4
 Weems, metals and ores, Nov. 7
 Wessel, disseminator, July 22
 Westhorpe, beveridges, Aug. 26
 Westley, nails, July 29
 Westrop, gloves, Jan. 12
 Westwood, preserving wood, Jan. 12
 Westwood, stop valves, Dec. 9
 Whipple, combing machine, April 20
 Whitaker, sewing machine, April 18
 White, radiating heat, Sept. 9
 White, ships' slips and ways, Sept. 30
 White, cylinder pistons, Oct. 7
 White, distilling oils, Dec. 9
 Whitehead, textile fabrics, Jan. 22
 Whitehead, fulling machine, Mar. 20
 Whitehouse, electrotypes, April 1
 Whitehouse, measure, April 18
 Whitgreave, locomotive engines, Oct. 7
 Whiting, tanning hides, May 2
 Whittaker, weaving fabrics, Nov. 21
 Whitworth, railway signals, Mar. 18
 Whitworth, fire-arms, April 18
 Whytlaw, weaving, Feb. 22
 Whytlaw, weaving, Nov. 7
 Whytock, printing yarns, Aug. 8
 Wickens, steam-engines, May 6
 Wickstead, sewage, Nov. 14
 Wigley, coffin handles, Nov. 18

Wild, shoes and boots, Dec. 30
 Wiley, pens and penholders, Aug. 8
 Wiley, metallic pens, Oct. 21
 Wilkes, copper tubes, May 20
 Wilkes, copper tubes, June 20
 Wilkes, cylinders, July 18
 Wilkes, printing fabrics, Oct. 24
 Wilkinson, carding cotton, April 1
 Wilkinson, cotton, April 15
 Wilkinson, felted cloths, April 25
 Wilkinson, looped fabrics, May 30
 Wilkinson, reaping machine, July 8
 Wilkinson, steering apparatus, Sept. 9
 Willett, gunpowder, Aug. 19
 Williams, bricks, Jan. 8
 Williams, agricultural machine, May 30
 Williams, water-closets, June 17
 Williams, ventilating, Sept. 26
 Williams, cultivation of land, Nov. 11
 Williamson, obtaining rosin, Sept. 19
 Williamson, evaporating, Dec. 19
 Willis, umbrellas, Feb. 1
 Wilson, cooking apparatus, Feb. 5
 Wilson, propellers, May 9
 Wilson, pneumatic moderator, June 6
 Wilson, valves, Nov. 4
 Wilson, rosin oil, Nov. 24
 Wilson, soap, Nov. 24
 Wilson, screw wrenches, Nov. 25
 Wilson, preparing skins, Nov. 25
 Wilson, power looms, Dec. 30
 Wimshurst, cutting tenons, Feb. 29
 Winfield, bedsteads, Jan. 22
 Winfield, metallic bedsteads, May 16
 Winfield, metallic bedsteads, July 8
 Witter, stove, Aug. 15
 Wohlgemuth, bridges, Mar. 14

Woller, weaving, Feb. 1
 Wood, artists' colours, Jan. 22
 Wood, piled fabrics, Feb. 22
 Wood, scutching flax, Mar. 25
 Wood, weaving fabrics, Sept. 26
 Wood, terry fabrics, Oct. 7
 Wood, weaving fabrics, Oct. 7
 Woodcock, steam-engines, Feb. 26
 Woodford, smoky chimneys, Nov. 24
 Woodley, paper bags, May 20
 Woodman, telegraphs, Oct. 24
 Woodrow, shirts, Feb. 15
 Woolbert, dyeing, Jan. 15
 Wormald, folding goods, July 22
 Wornum, piano-fortes, Nov. 11
 Worthington, measures, Mar. 20
 Wotherspoon, hats, July 8
 Wren, folding perambulator, Jan. 18
 Wright, bricks and tiles, Jan. 8
 Wright, crushing machine, Mar. 20
 Wright, furnaces, April 1
 Wright, boilers and iron ships, Aug. 26
 Wright, belt fastenings, Sept. 30
 Wright, ships' boats, Oct. 17
 Wyatt, rudders, April 25
 Yates, raising weights, May 2
 Yates, furnaces, Aug. 26
 Yeadon, reeds for weaving, Sept. 26
 Yeomanson, knitting fabrics, Oct. 3
 Young, steam-engines, Sept. 5
 Young, carriages, Sept. 23
 Youtman, valves and plugs, Sept. 26
 Zahn, plating machine, Feb. 29
 Zahn, windmills, July 25
 Zenner, washing ores, Mar. 4
 Zinkernagel, mosaic work, Feb. 22

POETRY.

THE SELF-EDUCATION OF AURORA LEIGH.

(*From "AURORA LEIGH," by Elizabeth Barrett Browning.*)

AND I, so young then, was not sullen. Soon
I used to get up early, just to sit
And watch the morning quicken in the grey,
And hear the silence open like a flower,
Leaf after leaf,—and stroke with listless hand
The woodbine through the window, till at last
I came to do it with a sort of love,
At foolish unaware : whereat I smiled,—
A melancholy smile, to catch myself
Smiling for joy.

Capacity for joy
Admits temptation. It seemed, next, worth while
To dodge the sharp sword set against my life ;
To slip down stairs through all the sleepy house,
As mute as any dream there, and escape
As a soul from the body, out of doors,—
Glide through the shrubberies, drop into the lane,
And wander on the hills an hour or two,
Then back again before the house should stir.

Or else I sate on in my chamber green,
And lived my life, and thought my thoughts, and prayed
My prayers without the vicar ; read my books,
Without considering whether they were fit
To do me good. Mark, there. We get no good
By being ungenerous, even to a book,
And calculating profits . . . so much help
By so much reading. It is rather when
We gloriously forget ourselves, and plunge
Soul-forward, headlong, into a book's profound,
Impassioned for its beauty and salt of truth—
'Tis then we get the right good from a book.

I read much. What my father taught before
From many a volume, Love re-emphasised
Upon the self-same pages : Theophrast
Grew tender with the memory of his eyes,

And Ælian made mine wet. The trick of Greek
 And Latin, he had taught me, as he would
 Have taught me wrestling or the game of fives
 If such he had known,—most like a shipwrecked man
 Who heaps his single platter with goats' cheese
 And scarlet berries; or like any man
 Who loves but one, and so gives all at once,
 Because he has it, rather than because
 He counts it worthy. Thus, my father gave;
 And thus, as did the women formerly
 By young Achilles, when they pinned the veil
 Across the boy's audacious front, and swept
 With tuneful laughs the silver-fretted rocks,
 He wrapt his little daughter in his large
 Man's doublet, careless did it fit or no.

But, after I had read for memory,
 I read for hope. The path my father's foot
 Had trod me out, which suddenly broke off,
 (What time he dropped the wallet of the flesh
 And passed) alone I carried on, and set
 My child-heart 'gainst the thorny underwood,
 To reach the grassy shelter of the trees.
 Ah, babe i' the wood, without a brother-babe!
 My own self-pity, like the red-breast bird,
 Flies back to cover all that past with leaves.

Sublimest danger, over which none weeps,
 When any young wayfaring soul goes forth
 Alone, unconscious of the perilous road,
 The day-sun dazzling in his limpid eyes,
 To thrust his own way, he an alien, through
 The world of books! Ah, you!—you think it fine,
 You clap hands—'A fair day!'—you cheer him on,
 As if the worst, could happen, were to rest.
 Too long beside a fountain. Yet, behold,
 Behold!—the world of books is still the world;
 And worldlings in it are less merciful
 And more puissant. For the wicked there
 Are winged like angels. Every knife that strikes,
 Is edged from elemental fire to assail
 A spiritual life. The beautiful seems right
 By force of beauty, and the feeble wrong
 Because of weakness. Power is justified,
 Though armed against St. Michael. Many a crown
 Covers bald foreheads. In the book-world, true,
 There's no lack, neither, of God's saints and kings,
 That shake the ashes of the grave aside
 From their calm locks, and undiscomfited
 Look steadfast truths against Time's changing mask.

True, many a prophet teaches in the roads ;
 True, many a seer pulls down the flaming heavens
 Upon his own head in strong martyrdom,
 In order to light men a moment's space.
 But stay !—who judges ?—who distinguishes
 'Twixt Saul and Nahash justly, at first sight,
 And leaves King Saul precisely at the sin,
 To serve King David ? who discerns at once
 The sound of the trumpets, when the trumpets blow
 For Alaric as well as Charlemagne ?
 Who judges prophets, and can tell true seers
 From conjurors ? The child, there ? Would you leave
 That child to wander in a battle-field
 And push his innocent smile against the guns ?
 Or even in the catacombs, . . . his torch
 Grown ragged in the fluttering air, and all -
 The dark a-mutter round him ? not a child !

I read books bad and good—some bad and good
 At once : good aims not always make good books :
 Well-tempered spades turn up ill-smelling soils
 In digging vineyards, even : books, that prove
 God's being so definitely, that man's doubt
 Grows self-defined the other side the line,
 Made atheist by suggestion ; moral books,
 Exasperating to license ; genial books,
 Discounting from the human dignity ;
 And merry books, which set you weeping when
 The sun shines,—ay, and melancholy books,
 Which make you laugh that any one should weep
 In this disjointed life, for one wrong more.

* * * * *

Books, books, books !

I had found the secret of a garret-room
 Piled high with cases in my father's name ;
 Piled high, packed large,—where, creeping in and out
 Among the giant fossils of my past,
 Like some small nimble mouse between the ribs
 Of a mastodon, I nibbled here and there
 At this or that box, pulling through the gap,
 In heats of terror, haste, victorious joy,
 The first book first. And how I felt it beat
 Under my pillow, in the morning's dark,
 An hour before the sun would let me read !
 My books !

At last, because the time was ripe,
I chanced upon the poets.

As the earth
Plunges in-fury, when the internal fires
Have reached and pricked her heart, and, throwing flat
The marts and temples, the triumphal gates
And towers of observation, clears herself
To elemental freedom—thus, my soul,
At poetry's divine first finger-touch,
Let go conventions and sprang up surprised,
Convicted of the great eternities
Before two worlds.

What's this, Aurora Leigh,
You write so of the poets, and not laugh?
Those virtuous liars, dreamers after dark,
Exaggerators of the sun and moon,
And soothsayers in a tea-cup?

I write so
Of the only truth tellers, now left to God,—
The only speakers of essential truth,
Opposed to relative, comparative,
And temporal truths; the only holders by
His sun-skirts, through conventional grey glooms;
The only teachers who instruct mankind,
From just a shadow on a charnel-wall,
To find man's veritable stature out,
Erect, sublime,—the measure of a man,
And that's the measure of an angel, says
The apostle. Ay, and while your common men
Build pyramids, gauge railroads, reign, reap, dine,
And dust the flaunty carpets of the world
For kings to walk on, or our senators,
The poet suddenly will catch them up
With his voice like a thunder. 'This is soul,
'This is life, this word is being said in heaven,
Here's God down on us! what are you about?
How all those workers start amid their work,
Look round, look up, and feel, a moment's space,
That carpet dusting, though a pretty trade,
Is not the imperative labour after all.

*

*

*

*

Many fervent souls
 Strike rhyme on rhyme, who would strike steel on steel
 If steel had offered, in a restless heat
 Of doing something. Many tender souls
 Have strung their losses on a rhyming thread,
 As children, cowslips :—the more pains they take,
 The work more withers. Young men, ay, and maids,
 Too often sow their wild oats in tame verse,
 Before they sit down under their own vine
 And live for use. Alas, near all the birds
 Will sing at dawn, and yet we do not take
 The chaffering swallow for the holy lark.

In those days, though, I never analysed
 Myself even. All analysis comes late.
 You catch a sight of Nature, earliest,
 In full front sun-face, and your eyelids wink
 And drop before the wonder of 't; you miss
 The form, through seeing the light. I lived, those days,
 And wrote because I lived—unlicensed else;
 My heart beat in my brain. Life's violent flood
 Abolished bounds,—and, which my neighbour's field,
 Which mine, what mattered? It is so in youth.
 We play at leap-frog over the god Term;
 The love within us and the love without
 Are mixed, confounded; if we are loved or love,
 We scarce distinguish. So, with other power.
 Being acted on and acting seem the same;
 In that first onrush of life's chariot-wheels,
 We know not if the forests move or we.

And so, like most young poets, in a flush
 Of individual life, I poured myself
 Along the veins of others, and achieved
 Mere lifeless imitations of live verse,
 And made the living answer for the dead,
 Profaning nature.

*

*

*

*

For me, I wrote
 False poems, like the rest, and thought them true,
 Because myself was true in writing them.
 I, peradventure, have writ true ones since
 With less complacence.

QUEEN MARY OF SCOTLAND.

(From Ayton's "Bothwell.")

I WAS the husband of a Queen,
The partner of a throne ;
For one short month the sceptred might
Of Scotland was my own.
The crown that father Fergus wore
Lay ready for my hand,
Yea, but for treason, I had been
The monarch of the land ;
The King of Scots in right of her
Who was my royal bride,
The fairest woman on the earth
That ere the sun espied.
O Mary—Mary ! Even now,
Seared as I am to shame,
The blood grows thick around my heart
At utterance of thy name !
I see her, as in bygone days,
A widow, yet a child,
Within the fields of sunny France,
When heaven and fortune smiled.
The violets grew beneath her feet,
The lilies budded fair,
All that is beautiful and bright
Was gathered round her there.
O lovelier than the fairest flower
That ever bloomed on green,
Was she, the darling of the land ;
That young and spotless Queen !
That sweet, sweet smile upon her lips,
Her eyes so kind and clear,
The magic of her gentle voice,
That even now I hear !
The nobles knelt, and princes bent
Before her as she came ;
A Queen by gift of nature she,
More than a Queen in name.
Even I, a rugged border lord,
Unused to courtly ways,
Whose tongue was never tutored yet
To lisp a polished phrase ;
I, who would rather on the heath
Confront a feudal foe,
Than linger in a royal hall
Where lackeys come and go—

I, who had seldom bent the knee
 At mass, or yet in prayer,
 Bowed down in homage at her feet,
 And paid my worship there!

QUEEN ELIZABETH OF ENGLAND.

(From the same.)

AND she, the sister, maiden Queen—
 Rare maid and sister she!
 True daughter of the Tudor line,
 Who claimed her crown by right divine,
 And ruled o'er land and sea—
 She who might well, without disgrace,
 Or any thought of fear,
 Have deigned, from her established place,
 To succour one so near—
 She, whom her slaves call wise in thought,
 And generous in deed,—
 How did she deal with Scotland's Queen,
 How help her in her need?

*

*

*

>

But at the gate the temptress stood,
 Not beautiful nor young;
 Nor luring, as a syren might,
 By magic of her tongue;
 High and imperious, stately, proud,
 Yet artful to beguile,
 A woman, without woman's heart,
 Or woman's sunny smile:
 By nature tyrannous and vain,
 By state-craft false and mean—
 She hated Mary from her soul,
 As woman and as Queen!

Men hate, because in act or strife
 They cross each other's path;
 Short is the space for jealousy,
 And fierce the hour of wrath:

Their passion, like the autumn flood,
Sweeps o'er the plain below;
But woman's hate runs deeper far,
Though noiseless in its flow.
A fairer face, a higher place,
More worship, more applause,
Will make a woman loathe her friend
Without a deadlier cause.
In this at least Elizabeth
To womankind was true,
For who would ever bend to her
When Mary was in view?
Mary, the bright and peerless moon
That shines aloft in Heaven,—
Elizabeth, the envious cloud
That o'er its disc is driven.
What mattered it that flattering knaves
Proclaimed her Beauty's Queen,
And swore in verse and fulsome rhyme,
'That never, since the birth of time,
Was such an angel seen?
Each morn and eve, her mirror gave
Their wretched words the lie:
And though she fain would have believed,
She could not close her eye.

And cause she had to hate and fear
Past woman's pride alone;
For Boleyn's daughter sat not safe
Nor surely on her throne.
And many a lord of England thought
On Mary's right and claim,
And owned her in their wassail cups
As Queen, though not by name.

INDEX.

N.B. The figures between [] refer to the History.

ACCIDENTS—Fatal boiler explosion at Tip-ton, 8; a dinner-party poisoned at Ding-wall, 10; a man rolled to death at Aber-dare, 12; fatal boat accident in Plymouth Sound, 12; fatal accident at the Shire-hall, Chelmsford, 38; explosion of the Hatton powder-mills, Hounslow, 57; terrible catastrophe on the Delaware River, U.S., 62; dreadful accident at the London Docks, 68; fatal boiler ex-plosion at Portsmouth Dockyard, 79; fatal accident to Mr. Featherstonhaugh, 80; fatal boiler-explosion at Glasgow, 94; terrible catastrophe at Cork, 101; fatal explosion at Woolwich Arsenal, 112; extraordinary accident at the West India Docks, 112; on board the *Nimrod* steamer at Cork, 114; colliery explosion in Glamorganshire, 12 lives lost, 116; colliery accident near Dudley, 132; fatal steam-boat collision on the Mersey, 132; fatal explosion at the Cymmer Colliery Pont-y-Pridd, 114 lives lost, 138; fright-ful railway accident in the United States, 100 lives lost, 140; a steamer burnt on the St. Lawrence, 30 lives lost, 140; serious accident at Goodwood Races, 145; explosion at Ramrod-hall colliery, 11 lives lost, 154; boiler explosion at Bury, 9 lives lost, 154; fall of a house in the City, 4 persons killed, 156; acci-dent at the Wellington Barracks, 157; steam-boat burnt on Lake Michigan, 60 lives lost, 158; fatal accident to Mr. Lewis Morgan, 159; five persons suffocated in a vat, 163; poisonings by mistake, 164; fatal accident to Baron de Robeck, 165; inundation of the Brynmally Mines, 13 persons drowned, 166; fatal accident at Sheerness Garrison, 166; boiler explo-sions at Watchet Paper Mills, and at Middleborough, 168; at the Surrey Gardens, during the preaching of Mr. Spurgeon, 7 persons killed, 170; dread-ful explosion of a collier at Cardiff, 173; in London, during a fog, 173; on the Greenwich Railway, 173; on the East-ern Counties Railway, 182; on the New-port and Hereford Railway, 183; dread-ful accident on the Kilkenny and Water-ford Railway, 186; explosion on the

steamer *Parana*, 5 lives lost, 188; acci-dent at the Bowling Iron Company's Works, Bradford, 199; return of acci-dents on railways in 1856, 204.

ACTS, LIST OF, 19 & 20 VICT.—i. Public General Acts, 349; ii. Local and Per-sonal Acts, declared public and to be judicially noticed, 353; iii. Private Acts, *printed*, 359; iv. Private Acts, *not printed*, 360.

Arts and Antiquities:—Sale of Mr. Rogers's Collection, 105; exhibition of the Royal Academy, 111.

BELGIUM—Alarm of the Belgian Govern-ment at the threats held out at the Con-gress of Paris against her press; ques-tion raised in the Belgian Chambers; statement of M. Vilain XIV. (220).

BIRTHS, 208.

BIRTHS—Summary of the BIRTHS, DEATHS, and MARRIAGES in England and Wales, and in the Metropolis, in the Year 1856; of the BIRTHS, DEATHS, and MAR-RIAGES in England and Wales, in ten Years, 1846 to 1856, 380.

CHINA—Outbreak of Hostilities with China; articles of the treaties of 1842 and 1843, [256]; colonial ordinance respecting trade; affair of the *Iorcha*, *Arrow*, [257]; long correspondence be-tween Commissioner Yeh and Sir John Bowring, [259]; the English fleet fire upon Canton, seize the forts and destroy war junks, [261]; destruction of fleets of pirates in the Chinese Seas, 6.

Colliery Accidents:—Explosion at the Ynisdavid colliery, Glamorganshire, 8 lives lost, 116; accident at the Old Park colliery, Dudley, 8 persons killed, 132; explosion at the Cymmer Colliery, Pontypridd, 114 lives lost, 138; at the Ramrod-hall colliery, Oldbury, 7 lives lost, 154; inundation of the Brynmally Mines, 13 lives lost, 166.

CORN, HAY, STRAW, CLOVER, and BUTCHERS' MEAT, Prices of, 379.

Covent Garden Theatre destroyed by fire, 45.

INDEX.

DEATHS—Summary of the DEATHS, BIRTHS, and MARRIAGES in England and Wales, and in the Metropolis in the Year 1856, and in England and Wales in ten Years, 1846 to 1856, 380.

DEATHS—Acland, lady, 260; Adam, M. 253; Adams, dean, 284; Adams, gen. sir G. P. 259; Adams, serg. 230; Agar, hon. capt. 234; Ailesbury, marq. of, 228; Allcard, J. 250; Anderson, sir J. E. 244; Anderson, T. O. 262; Anstruther, lady, 260; Arabin, mrs. M. 258; Arkwright, G. 238; Armstrong, Dr. (Bp. of Graham's-town), 255; Armstrong, mrs. E. 287; Atherton, Mrs. M. 282; Atkinson, sir J. 275; Attwood, T. 245; Aubrey, sir T. D. 269; Austen, lady, 290.

Babington, G. G. 226; Bagot, lord, 239; Bandon, earl of, 277; Barneby, W. 290; Basden, col. 256; Bastard, E. R. P. 259; Bayly, mrs. M. W. 265; Beaclerk, lord H. 234; Beatty, J. 246; Beechy, adm. F. W. 283; Bell, mrs. 253; Bellamy, C. 254; Bellingham, mrs. M. 262; Bennett, J. E. 252; Bennett, G. 256; Beresford, J. 269; Berners, lady, 274; Berry, lady, 254; Betham, lady, 290; Bingham, mrs. S. 246; Birch, gen. 256; Blackett, J. F. B. 252; Blakeston, mrs. E. 247; Bochsa, M. 234; Bond, A. C. 277; Borough, W. 249; Boston, lord, 246; Boughy, major, 250; Bourne, capt. 261; Bowdich, mrs. 270; Bowdler, rev. T. 279; Bowring, C. 249; Bowring, miss L. J. 247; Bowyer, mrs. F. 235; Braham, J. 240; Braybroke, lady, 270; Bridges, miss L. 260; Brotherton, J. 229; Brongham, miss M. 256; Browne, G. T. 257; Buchan, G. 227; Buckland, rev. dr. 265; Buller, lady A. 257; Burnaby, Mrs. H. A. 228; Burnett, miss M. 238; Burnett, miss M. A. 287; Burrard, rev. sir G. 256; Burroughs, lieut. 230; Burton, hon. mrs. 252; Butler, lieut.-gen. hon. H. E. 285; Butterworth, gen. 278.

Caddell, hon. mrs. P. 253; Calley, mrs. F. E. 237; Cambell, maj.-gen. 246; Cameron, lieut.-col. 256; Campbell, adm. 287; Campbell, J. R. 243; Canning, mrs. J. 265; Carlisle, bishop of, 238; Carr, miss S. L. 247; Carr, sir W. O. 251; Cavendish, hon. F. 246; Chalmer, maj.-gen. sir A. 287; Cholmeley, H. P. 264; Churchill, lord A. A. S. 287; Clarke, col. 243; Clarke, lady, 261; Clarkson, mrs. C. 236; Clarkson, mrs. S. 282; Clarkson, W. 277; Claxon, J. 277; Clement-

DEATHS—*continued.*

son, J. 234; Clough, Mrs. E. 238; Clutterbuck, dr. 251; Cobden, R. 250; Cochrane, lady, 247; Cocks, rev. J. S. 261; Coffin, maj.-gen. 250; Cole, capt. 254; Collingwood, mrs. A. L. 230; Cork, bishop of, 228; Cornwall, mrs. L. G. 269; Cowper, captain, W. 285; Cowper, earl, 251; Cox, J. L. 237; Craig, hon. R. R. 246; Crawley, rev. C. 232; Crawford, W. 276; Crampton, Masters G. R. and P. C. 265; Crampton, Mrs. L. 265; Cresswell, O. A. B. 246; Crewe, hon. mrs. 252; Crichton, sir A. 257; Croughton, mrs. H. 228; Crowther, rev. J. 231; Cruickshank, R. 246; Crivelli, signor, 290; Cuming, gen. sir. H. J. 283; Cunliffe, lady, 279; Cunningham, miss A. E. 254; Cunninghame, mrs. A. H. 256; Curgenven, mrs. E. 285; Cust, hon. miss L. 262.

Dani, capt. 232; Davy, gen. sir W. G. 235; Dawson-Damer, rt. hon. G. L. 250; Dawson, hon. mrs. 269; Dawson, rt. hon. G. R. 249; Denison, hon. miss T. M. 275; Deacon, lady, 217; De Calabrella, baroness, 275; De Fontanelle, lady M. 290; De Moleyn, major, 266; De Murrieta, Don F. L. 245; De Robeck, baron, 274; De Salis, countess, 277; De Vere, lady, 239; De Vismes, comtesse, 235; Dent, mrs. 256; Dickonson, rev. H. 282; Digby, earl of, 254; Dixon, mrs. H. 232; Don, G. 243; Doubleday, J. 235; Dodsworth, mrs. E. 277; Donoughmore, dow. ctss. of, 287; Douglas, capt. 252; Doyle, sir J. M. 264; Drummond, col. 280; Ducket, sir G. 260; Dudley, rev. J. 229; Dunbar, J. 277; Dundas, C. W. D. 250; Dundas, miss F. B. 274; Dwarries, lady, 259; Dymoke, mrs. A. A. J. 252.

Eagle, F. K. 258; Edridge, J. 228; Egerton, W. 251; Elford, miss, G. C. 243; Eliot, mrs. M. 231; Erroll, dow. countess of, 231; Evans, dr. 245; Evans, Eyre, 236; Evans, gen. 290; Evans, W. 256; Evans, W. 250; Eustace, rev. C. 228; Ewing, mrs. 246.

Fahie, lady, 278; Farnham, ctss. of, 239; Farquharson, col. 250; Faulkner, lady B. 261; Ferguson, J. 229; Featherstonhaugh, T. 250; Fitzclarence, Lord A. 255; Fitz Roy, lord J. 290; Fitzsimon, C. 262; Fleming, capt. 246; Forbes, mrs. L. 261; Fortescue, G. G. 278; Fox, R. M. 252; Fleming, lieut. 267; Fowke, Sir F. G. 256; Fox, lieut.-col. 249; Fraser, J. B. 237; Frazer, lady, 281; Fuller, mrs. C. 232.

INDEX.

DEATHS—*continued.*

Gadesden, J. 288; Garbutt, mrs. J. 287; Gardner, R. 257; Garvock, mrs. M. 235; Gaskell, B. 234; Gilbert, miss L. G. 266; Gloucester, bp. of (dr. Monk), 257; Glover, mrs. G. 256; Godby, rear-adm. 244; Gooch, sir E. S. 278; Gooch, lady, 251; Gordon, lieutenant-gen. 265; Gordon, comm. 234; Gore, hon. mrs. G. 243; Goulburn, rt. hon. H. 230; Grahamstown, bp. of (dr. Armstrong), 255; Grant, sir R. I. 262; Gray, mrs. E. 252; Greene, A. S. 268; Greenstreet, gen. 250; Grey, lieutenant-gen. sir J. 243; Grinston, hon. C. 275; Gurney, J. 270; Gurney, S. 257; Guthrie, G. I. 252; Guyon, gen. 276; Gwilt, G. 260; Gwyther, miss H. M. 250; Gwyther, E. M. 250; Gwyther, miss P. C. 250; Gwyther, master J. B. P. 250; Gwyther, miss C. A. 250.

Haggard, de, 277; Halkett, gen. sir C. 274; Hamilton, hon. mrs. 261; Hamilton, sir W. 253; Hamilton, mrs. F. A. 253; Hamilton, H. 287; Hann, J. 266; Hardinge, lord, 271; Hardy, miss A. S. M. 256; Harford, C. G. 232; Harrington, miss H. B. 256; Harris, rev. dr. 288; Harrison, B. 256; Hartman, gen. sir J. 258; Harvey, lady H. 249; Hawarden, viscount, 276; Hay, lieutenant-general, 263; Haydn, J. 232; Hayles, J. 277; Henry, lady E. E. 238; Herbert, J. A. 284; Heys, miss I. 237; Hinde, (2) misses, 261; Hoare, sir R. 230; Hoare, mrs. H. 234; Hodgson, miss, 261; Hodson, J. 274; Hollingworth, archd. 238; Hope, hon. mrs. 256; Hornby, hon. mrs. G. 261; Hornby, mrs. M. L. 262; Hort, lady, 258; Hotham, adm. 276; Howth, dow. countess of, 269; Hughes, mrs. C. 269; Hughes, J. F. 277; Hunloke, sir H. 238; Hunlocke, sir J. 260; Hunter, ald. 270; Huskisson, mrs. 250; Hussey, prof. 285.

Image, rev. T. 246; Inglis, col. 256; Irvine, capt. 247.

Jackson, hon. I. 262; Jardine, D. 277; Jervis, sir J. 277; Jervis, mrs. S. 278; Johnston, adm. 276; Jones, maj.-gen. 270.

Kent, mrs. G. 254; Kerr, hon. A. T. 266; Key, mrs. A. 287; King, hon. and rev. R. F. 270; King, rear-adm. 244; Knight, mrs. M. E. 261; Knightley, lady, 262; Knox, col. 261; Knyvett, W. 279; Kuper, H. G. 286.

Lamb, C. M. 285; Lamb, C. 287; Landerdale, countess of, 269; La Touche, P. 232; Lawson, H. 226; Lechmere, Sir E. H. 249; Leckie, Mrs.

DEATHS—*continued.*

E. 249; Lee, mrs. S. 270; Leeds, dow. duchess of, 262; Legh, mrs. M. 259; Legro, M. 285; Leigh, miss C. 254; Lennard, T. B. 258; Lewis, W. F. 287; Liddell, hon. T. 246; Lindpaintner, herr, 266; Lindsay, G. 287; Linning, prince Karl of, 278; Listowel, earl of, 238; Littler, lieutenant-gen. sir J. H. 242; Littler, miss D. F. 235; Lockhart, W. 282; Long, mrs. M. 252; Lowe, A. 265; Lushington, hon. mrs. 247.

Macdonald, lieutenant-gen. 257; Macdonald, lieutenant-col. 279; Macdougall, mrs. L. A. 269; Mackenzie, sir A. 227; Mackinnon, mrs. M. S. 248; Macnamara, col. 279; Malet, lieutenant-gen. 287; Marsack, G. H. 236; Massingberd, P. 270; Mathew, father, 286; Matthews, mrs. (madame Vestris) 262; Maxwell, lady H. 260; May, J. 256; Maynard, J. A. 254; Meek, sir J. 256; Melville, hon. W. H. L. 250; Meynell, E. 240; Micklethwait, N. 229; Micklethwaite, lieutenant-col. 261; Middleton, Mr. and Mrs. 261; Middleton, lord, 278; Milford, lord, 227; Millet, F. 262; Miller, miss E. M. 263; Miller, Hugh, 288; Milman, gen. 287; Mitchell, mrs. C. F. 279; Monk, dr. (bisp. of Gloucester) 257; Moore, rev. H. 254; Moore, lieutenant-col. 278; Mortimer, dr. 251; Morrison, sir J. W. 261; Moser, P. 267; Mosley, O. 274; Mostyn, miss M. B. 236; Moubray, capt. 270; Mountain, rev. J. G. 275; Muller, mrs. M. L. 226; Murray, hon. R. D. 269; Murray, lieutenant. 250; Musgrave, mrs. E. F. 266.

Nares, mrs. C. 251; Neeld, J. 247; Nepean, sir M. H. 257; Nevill, R. J. 231; Newbolt, lady, 232; Newton, lieutenant. 261; Nisbett, lady, 253; Norfolk, duke of, 242; North, hon. mrs. S. 266; North, mrs. R. 247; Nugent, lady M. A. 265.

O'Brien, lady, 274; O'Callaghan, hon. G. 246; Ongley, hon. M. H. 240; Onslow, capt. 267; Osborne, lady, 275; Outram, sir B. F. 240.

Palmer, mrs. A. M. 276; Parker, sir H. 247; Paskiewitsch, prince, 235; Pate, R. F. 262; Paterson, lieutenant-gen. 259; Paterson, comm. 246; Peacock, maj.-gen. 260; Pearsall, R. L. 262; Pearson, capt. 267; Pearson, H. 237; Pearsun, very rev. H. N. 279; Pease, mrs. A. 249; Pell, miss M. M. 230; Pelly, lady, 237; Pembroke, dow. countess of, 248; Penn, Miss I. M. 235; Penn, miss H. 261; Pepys, W. H. 266;

INDEX.

DEATHS—*continued.*

Perceval, D. M. 268; Perceval, mrs. C. A. 260; Percy, dr. (bishop of Carlisle) 238; Percy, adm. 276; Petit, gen. baron, 261; Pottinger, miss A. 261; Pottinger, lieut.-gen. sir H. 246; Power, lieut.-col. 280; Prendergast, gen. sir J. 261; Price, T. 236; Prickett, rear-adm. 259; Purvis, Mrs. J. 262.

Queensbury, marq. of, 287.

Ramsay, hon. mrs. P. 290; Ranken, maj. 244; Ravensworth, lady, 262; Reach, A. B. 282; Reeves, J. 247; Rendel, J. M. 280; Rendlesham, lady, 267; Reynell, lady, 229; Reynolds, mrs. A. 254; Reston, mrs. 290; Ricardo, miss B. 265; Ridgway, lieut.-col. 259; Rivers, lieut. W. 285; Rivington, miss E. 279; Roden, cntss. dow. of, 282; Rodney, hon. M. 249; Rogers, adm. 230; Rogers, rev. J. 259; Rogers, mrs. S. 237; Rolt, gen. sir J. 278; Rooke, J. 252; Romilly, lady, 290; Rowlatt, comm. 232; Rudd, rev. E. 251; Rutland, duke of, 232.

Sadleir, J. 241; Said Effendi, 228; St. Aubyn, lady, 259; St. Germans, cntss. of, 261; St. John, rev. E. 249; Sale, J. B. 276; Sandes, miss M. C. 253; Scarborough, earl of, 277; Scott, R. 243; Sharpe, D. 257; Shaw, mrs. M. 232; Shawn, Nabontree, 284; Shee, col. 261; Sherbrooke, lady, 254; Sherrard, lady J. 287; Shewell, col. 274; Shirley, E. 290; Shrewsbury, earl of, 264; Shrewsbury, cntss. of, 257; Sina, baron, 256; Sinclair, hon. J. 232; Slesman, gen. sir W. H. 239; Sleigh, C. C. 249; Smith, mrs. H. 275; Smith, mrs. S. M. 276; Smythe, sir E. J. 246; Standish, W. S. 261; Stapleton, hon. G. 287; Stevenson, adm. 290; Stewart, lady, 274; Stoddart, sir J. 240; Stoddart, rev. W. W. 281; Stones, maj. 230; Stovin, lady, 249; Stradbroke, dow. cntss. of, 231; Strutt, W. 232; Sutton, miss L. M. 240; Swann, mrs. M. H. 254; Symes, rear adm. 244; Symonds, adm. sir W. 248.

Tait, miss C. 245; Miss S. E. C. 245; Miss F. A. M. 245; Miss C. A. 245; and Miss M. S. 245; Tatham, rev. dr. 232; Thellusson, C. 238; Thompson, lieut.-gen. 281; Thompson, capt. 259; Thompson, sergt. 287; Thornton, col. 244; Thornton, miss M. 266; Tierney, sir E. 254; Torenson, hon. R. 248; Townsend, T. 248; Townley, mrs. C. 253; Trelawny, sir W. L. S. 279; Trotter, J. 267; Turner, C. W. 235.

DEATHS—*continued.*

Ure, dr. 226; Utterson, lieut. 287.

Valentia, visetss. 235; Varley, W. F. 237; Vereker, hon. miss, J. G. 261; Verner, miss F. E. 265; Vestris, madame (mrs. Matthews), 262; Villiers, hon. mrs. 231; Vincent, mrs. P. 230; Von der Hagen, prof. 259; Von Hammer, baron, 282.

Wake, mrs. C. 279; Walker, mrs. C. M. 266; Walmisley, dr. 232; Walpole, rev. R. 251; Wandesforde, J. B. C. S. 261; Warden, maj. 285; Warren, lieut. W. B. 287; Watson, mrs. C. 269; Watson, miss S. H. 253; Waugh, G. 231; Webb, rev. dr. 228; Westmacott, sir R. 267; Westminster, dean of (dr. Buckland), 265; Wetherall, adm. 288; Whaites, hon. mrs. 261; Wharnccliffe, dow. lady, 251; Whympers, miss E. 259; Widdrington, comm. 230; Wilberforce, lieut. 244; Wilder, lady, 230; Willard, major, 246; Wilmot, W. 257; Wilson, gen. sir J. 260; Wilson, right rev. dr. (bishop of Cork), 228; Wilson, lieut.-gen. 249; Wilson, J. 256; Wilson, mrs. L. B. 261; Wickham, J. 282; Wodehouse, miss A. 251; Wombwell, lady, 247; Wood, dean, 238; Wood, J. 275; Woodward, F. 278; Woronzoff, prince M. 280; Wright, gen. 245; Wyatt, J. 265; Wynn, rt. hon. sir H. W. W. 248;

Yarburgh, Y. 235; Yarrell, W. 269; Yates, R. V. 2; Young, lady, 263.

EARTHQUAKE in the Mediterranean, at Malta, Sicily, S. Italy, Corfu, Candia, &c., 168.

FINANCE ACCOUNTS for the Year 1856, 362.

FIRES—Extensive fire at Rotherhithe, 17; destruction of the Pavilion Theatre, Whitechapel, 30; great fire in Clerkenwell, 31; in Three Cranes Lane, Upper Thames Street, 41; destruction of Covent Garden Theatre, 45; at Messrs. Scott Russell's ship-yard, Millwall, 59; at the Caledonian Distillery, Edinburgh, 94; village of Kenton destroyed by fire, 95; in Finsbury, three lives lost, 100; at Shad-Thames Flour Mills, 141; destruction of Messrs. Broadwood's Pianoforte Manufactory, 153; three fires in London, 160; extensive fires in St. Martin's Lane, 183.

FRANCE.—Speech of the Emperor on opening the Legislative Assembly [227]; address of the President, the count de Morny [228]; birth of an heir to the

INDEX.

FRANCE—*continued.*

Imperial Throne [230], 63; his baptism, 123; reception of the Russian Ambassador at the Court of the Tuileries, [230]; great inundations in the Central Departments, 117.

GREAT BRITAIN.—State of public feeling at the opening of the year; improved condition of military affairs, particularly in the Crimea [1]; general mercantile prosperity; opening of the Session of Parliament by the Queen in person; Her Majesty's Speech [2]. [*See* PARLIAMENT.]

INDIA.—Viscount Canning succeeds the marq. of Dalhousie as Governor-General; annexation of the Kingdom of Oude [248]; the command of the Madras Army conferred on a Company's Officer (Sir P. Grant), 15.

IRELAND.—The Irish Census—supplementary report, 71; murders and outrages in Ireland, 72; murder of Mrs. Sarah Kelly, 81; of Miss Hind, conviction and execution of the murderers, 82.

LAW AND POLICE.—Robbery of the Royal nursery Plate, 62; robbery by an Ordnance clerk at Portsmouth, singular capture, 69; embezzlement by a Bank Manager, at Tewkesbury, 146; singular robbery from a foundation stone, 172; immense frauds on the Great Northern Railway, 185.

MARRIAGES, 215.

MARRIAGES, BIRTHS, and DEATHS, Table of, for ten years, 1846 to 1856, 380.

METEOROLOGICAL TABLE for the year 1856, 380.

MINISTRY, The, as it stood on the 1st January 1856, 205.

MISCELLANEOUS.—The weather in January, 1; launch of the *Persia*, mail steamer, 1; destruction of pirates in the Chinese seas, 6; the Peace, acceptance of the propositions of the Allies, by Russia, 10; a dinner-party poisoned at Dingwall, 10; the army bounty money, 11; the Polish legion, 12; the Order of the Bath conferred on French officers, 13; the Indian army—the Madras command, 15; eruption of the volcano of Hawaii, 16; presentation of a jewel to Miss Nightingale by Her Majesty, 16; the Peace, the Armistice, 17; destructive storm in the North, 30; loan of £5,000,000, 38; sale of copyrights, 40; Cambridge and Edinburgh elections, 41; explosion of the Hatton powder-mills, Hounslow, 57; strange

MISCELLANEOUS—*continued.*

and fatal duel at Berlin, death of Herr von Hinckeldy, 58; suicide from the whispering-gallery of St. Paul's, 60; robbery of the royal nursery plate, 62; university boat-race, 63; birth of the Imperial Prince, 62; his baptism, 123; confirmation of the Princess Royal, 63; two High Sheriffs fined, 65; signature of the Treaty of Peace; reception of the news, 71; demolition of the last gibbet, 72; death of five children from starvation, 80; the Sunday bands in the Parks, 92; Her Majesty's visit to Chatham hospitals, 95; and to Aldershot camp, 97; the great naval review, 97; proclamation of Peace, 100; sale of Mr. Rogers' collection, 105; exhibition of the Royal Academy, 111; loan of £5,000,000, 113; celebration of the Peace, grand fireworks and illuminations, 115; great inundations in France, 117; erroneous conviction—case of John Markham, 118; the Wellington college, 122; Ascot races, 123; display of the great fountains at the Crystal Palace, 124; mutiny of the Tipperary militia, 133; Goodwood races, singular accident, 145; riots at Kelso, 152; failure of the Royal British bank, 155; fall of a house in the City, four persons killed, 156; combinations amongst workmen, interesting trial, 161; poisonings by mistake, 164; the weather in September, 165; extensive earthquakes in the Mediterranean, 167; preaching of Mr. Spurgeon, fatal accident at the Surrey gardens, 170; explosion of a collier at Cardiff, 173; dense fog in London, in October, numerous accidents, 173; the Crystal Palace frands by Robson, 175; "Big Ben" of Westminster, the bell of the new Palace, 179; immense frauds on the Great Northern railway, by Redpath, 185; the Turner collection of pictures, 192; the weather in December, 202; sanatory condition of England, 202; wrecks in 1856, 203; return of railway accidents in 1856, 204.

MORTALITY.—Summary of the DEATHS, BIRTHS, and MARRIAGES, in ENGLAND and WALES, and of the DEATHS and BIRTHS in the METROPOLIS, in the year 1856, 380.

Of the MARRIAGES, BIRTHS and DEATHS in ENGLAND and WALES in ten years 1846 to 1856, 380.

MURDERS AND SUICIDES.—Murder of a child by starvation, 2; double child-murder at Hoxton, 3; double child-murder

INDEX.

MURDERS AND SUICIDES—*continued.*

at Chelsea, 4; murder of Mr. Waugh, 9; trial of the murderer, 9; of a wife and three children in Soho, 18; murder of the Duchesse de Caumont Laforce at Paris, 31; suicide of Mr. John Sadleir, M.P., 33; of Mr. W. Tatham, at the Royal Exchange, Manchester, 39; the Matfen murder, 42; of William Hales, at Chelmsford, 43; of John Acres Fowkes (the Snarestone murder), 53; of C. W. Hope, on the Stirling Castle convict ship, 56; suicide from the whispering gallery of St. Paul's, 60; child-murder in Suffolk, 68; murders in Ireland, of Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Callaghan, Margaret Withers, and others, 72; of James House at Liverpool, 74; of Mrs. Sarah Kelly, 81; of Miss Hind, 82; the Uxbridge murders, 84; by Celestina Sommer, of her child (the Islington murder), 87; attempted assassinations in Rupert Street, 96; of sergeant-major Robinson in Plymouth Sound, 121; supposed murder of Mrs. McKnight at Ilkley, 124; murder of two girls at Folkestone by a soldier of the German Legion, 149; suicide and attempted murder at Dudley, 154; murder of a gaoler at Spike Island, 164; highway robbery and murder near Rotherham, 168; murder of a child at Dover, 171; murder at Erith, and suicide of the murderer, 180; murder of a child at Wokingham, 183; mysterious murder of Mr. Little at Dublin (the Broadstone tragedy), 184; adultery and murder in Canada, 188; shocking murder in Parliament-street, 189; murder and piracy, trial of the pirates, 192; double murder in Yorkshire, of Mr. and Mrs. White, 195; murder of two children by their father, at Chester, 197; of Jane Banham, near Leeds (the Armley murder), 198; murder of sergeant McBurnie, at Dover, 200. The Rugeley murders, 387; murder of Mrs. Dove (the Leeds poisoning case), 529. [*See also TRIALS AND LAW CASES.*]

NAPLES—Numerous political arrests and great cruelties to the prisoners, [235]; the king haughtily rejects the counsels of England and France, [234]; remonstrance addressed through the French minister; reply of the Neapolitan minister, [235]; the British and French governments discontinue diplomatic intercourse with the Neapolitan court, and prepare squadrons for an emergency, [236]; the court of Russia

NAPLES—*continued.*

remonstrate against these proceedings, [236]; attempt by a soldier named Milano, to assassinate the king; he is arrested and executed, [237].

PARLIAMENT.—The session opened by the Queen in person. Her Majesty's speech from the throne, [2]; the address discussed without amendment in either house, [3]; in the Lords the Earl of Gosford moves and the Earl of Abingdon seconds the address, [4]; sarcastic speech of the Earl of Derby, [4]; answered by the Earl of Clarendon; explanations of the negotiations, [8]; after remarks from Lords Granville and Campbell, address agreed to, [11]; in the Commons, address moved by Mr. Byng and seconded by Mr. Baxter; commented on by Mr. Disraeli, [11]; answer of Lord Palmerston, [12]; Mr. Roebuck and others add a few observations; address agreed to, [14].

The fall of Kars.—Motion of Mr. Whiteside; his speech, [14]; three nights' debate; answer of the Attorney-General, [18]; speeches of Lord J. Manners inculcating, and of the Lord Advocate defending, the Government, [19]; debate adjourned, [20]; speech of Mr. J. S. Phillimore; amendment moved by Mr. Ker Seymer, to defer the consideration of the question, [20]; the Chancellor of the Exchequer denies the effect on the negotiations, [20]; and is attacked by Sir J. Pakington, [21]; after speeches of Mr. Layard and others, debate again adjourned, [23]; resumed by Sir E. Bulwer Lytton; Sir J. Graham, [23]; Mr. Disraeli, [24]; Lord J. Russell, Lord Palmerston, [25]; reply of Mr. Whiteside; motion rejected by a large majority, [26]; honours and pension conferred on General Williams, [26].

Sir Charles Napier moves a committee of inquiry into the Baltic campaign of 1854-5, and makes his defence, [27]; answered by Sir C. Wood and Sir J. Graham, [28]; Sir G. Berkeley, [29]; other members address the House; motion withdrawn, [30].

The Treaty of Peace; announced in the House of Commons by Lord Palmerston, [31]; debate in the Lords on the Treaty; Lords Ellesmere and Glenelg move and second an address of thanks, [32]; Treaty criticised by the Earl of Malmesbury, [35]; the Earl of Clarendon explains and defends the Treaty, [36]; which is attacked by the

INDEX.

PARLIAMENT—*continued.*

Earl of Derby, [39]; Earl Granville and the Earl of Aberdeen make objections; answered by Lord Cowley, [40]; Earl Grey, [41]; Duke of Argyle; address agreed to, [42]. In the Commons—Address moved by Mr. E. Denison, seconded by Mr. H. Herbert, [42]; Treaty commented on by Lord J. Manners, [43]; Mr. Milnes; Mr. Layard; Lord J. Russell, [44]; Lord C. Hamilton, Sir C. Wood, [45]; debate adjourned. Mr. W. S. Lindsay, Mr. R. Phillimore, Marquis of Granby, Mr. S. Herbert, who strongly commends the Government, [46]; Mr. M. Gibson commends the introduction of the new Maritime code, [48]; Mr. Gladstone comments on the protocols, predicting great evils from the attacks on the press, particularly in Belgium, [50]; Lord Palmerston defends the Treaty and negotiations, [52]; Address agreed to, and presented to Her Majesty, [54].

Votes of Thanks by both Houses to the Army and Navy, in the Lords, [54]; in the Commons, [57]; with warm eulogiums from all parties.

Differences with America.—Questions respecting Central America (the Bulwer-Clayton treaty) and enlistment; Mr. G. H. Moore's motion condemning the Government, his speech, [59]; opposed by the Attorney-General, [60]; supported by Sir F. Thesiger, Mr. Baillie, [62]; defence of Sir G. Grey, [62]; debate adjourned; motion supported by Mr. M. Gibson, [63]; speeches of Mr. Baxter, Mr. Peacocke, and Mr. Spooner, [64]; Mr. Gladstone opposes the motion, but condemns the Government, [65]; reply of the Solicitor-General, [68]; Sir J. Pakington; answer of Lord Palmerston, [69]; motion defeated by large majority, [71].

Persia.—Mr. Layard calls attention to our relations with Persia, [69]; Lord Palmerston's reply, [70].

Italy.—Lord Lyndhurst calls attention to the affairs of Italy; his able speech, [72]; Earl of Clarendon's reply, [75]; observation of Marquis of Clanricarde and Marquis of Lansdowne, [77]; in the Commons Lord J. Russell brings forward the same subject, [77]; Lord Palmerston's reply, [79]; speeches of Mr. Disraeli, [80]; Mr. Bowyer, [83]; Mr. M. Milner, Mr. Whiteside, Mr. J. G. Phillimore, [84].

Life Peerages.—Creation of Sir J. Parke (Lord Wensleydale) to a peerage for life,

PARLIAMENT—*continued.*

[85]; Lord Lyndhurst brings the constitutional question before the House of Lords, [85]; interesting debate, views of Earl Granville, [88]; Lord St. Leonards, the Lord Chancellor, [89]; Lord Campbell, [90]; Earl Grey, the Earl of Derby, [91]; Lord Lyndhurst's motion carried against Government, [95]; consequent proceedings, [95]; Committee of Privileges appointed; resolution of Lord Lyndhurst; amendment of Earl Grey, [96]; Lord Glenelg's motion that certain questions be put to the Judges negatived, [98]; debate on the resolution and amendment, [99]; resolution agreed to [100]; the Committee report against the legality of life peerages; the Government acquiesce, and Sir J. Parke receives an hereditary peerage, [101]. *The Appellate Jurisdiction of the House of Lords*; the Earl of Derby moves the appointment of Committee to inquire into this subject, which is agreed to, [102]; Committee recommend the appointment of two salaried "Deputy Speakers;" the Appellate Jurisdiction Bill introduced in consequence; it proposes that two judges should be created life peers, to be called "Deputy Speakers," with salaries, [104]; petition of Lord Wensleydale to the Commons; bill brought forward by the Attorney-General, [105]; Mr. Bowyer opposes the bill, [106]; speech of Sir J. Graham, [107]; Mr. R. Palmer, [108]; Lord J. Russell, the Solicitor-General, [109]; second reading carried; but on motion of Mr. R. Currie, bill referred to a select committee and dropped, [111].

International Maritime Law.—Motion of Lord Colchester condemning the declaration respecting maritime law, [112]; opposed by Earl of Clarendon, [113]; interesting discussion; declaration ably attacked by Earl of Derby, [116]; resolution negatived, [118]; motion of Mr. Napier for appointment of a Minister of Justice, [118]; view of the Government, [121]; Lord J. Russell, Lord Palmerston, [121]; Mr. R. Palmer, resolution modified and agreed to, [122]; the same subject brought before the House of Lords by Lord Brougham; his masterly statement, [122]; the Lord Chancellor's statement respecting the consolidation of the law, [125]; Sir G. Grey introduces a bill for establishing a police force throughout the kingdom, [126]; after much discussion the bill is carried, [128]; bill introduced enabling

INDEX.

PARLIAMENT—*continued.*

the Bishops of London and Durham to resign their sees, [128]; after animated discussion on the whole subject, the bill is passed, [130]; correspondence between the two Bishops, and the Prime Minister, [131]; the bill brought forward in the House of Commons, [132]; Sir W. Heathcote opposes it, [133]; abstract of the debate; after much discussion in committee, bill passed, [137].

Finance.—The Navy Estimates moved by Sir C. Wood; discussion on these and the Supplemental Estimates, [138]; the Ordnance Estimates, [140]; discussion raised on the Supplemental Ordnance Estimates, [141]; Mr. Muntz's resolution for an adjustment of the Income and Property Tax, [142]; the Chancellor of the Exchequer defends the existing system [142]; resolution negatived; the Chancellor of the Exchequer makes a preliminary statement of Ways and Means, [144]; and introduces the Budget, [145]; the financial plans of the Government criticised by Mr. Disraeli, [151]; after discussion, the resolutions are agreed to, [153].

National Education.—Lord J. Russell's proposed resolutions for a great extension of the existing system, including an educational rate; his comprehensive speech, [155]; the subject discussed in committee; Mr. Henley opposes the scheme, [159]; criticisms of Mr. Adelerly, Mr. Ellice, [160]; opposition of Sir J. Graham, [161]; Sir J. Pakington defends the resolutions, [162]; Lord J. Russell replies to the objections, but withdraws material parts of his scheme, [164]; discussion continued on the remainder; views of Mr. Gladstone, [166]; the resolutions are defeated, [167]; Sir G. Grey brings forward the Educational Estimates, [167]; Cambridge University Bill introduced on report of commission, [168]; defence of the University by Mr. Walpole, [169]; Bill is discussed and extensively altered in Committee, [171]; in the Lords the Bill is agreed to, except two clauses, one respecting the power of the Commissioners, another respecting the admission of Dissenters to the governing body; these amendments are agreed to by the Commons, [172]; interesting debate on the national system of Education in Ireland, commenced by Mr. Walpole, [172]; resisted by Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Horsman; supported by Mr. G. A. Hamilton and Mr. Napier, motion carried against the Government,

PARLIAMENT—*continued.*

[175]; the Ministry consider the resolution a fatal inroad on the national system; and Mr. Fortescue moves a counter-resolution, [175]; this is opposed by Mr. Walpole, [176]; Lord J. Russell supports the reversal; after animated debate the counter-resolution is carried, [178]; the Queen's answer to Mr. Walpole's address, [178]; renewed discussion on the Maynooth Grant; Mr. Walpole's motion for a committee, [179]; the Government are defeated, but Mr. Spooner is obliged to withdraw his motion, [179]; appointment of a Vice-President of the Committee of Council of Education, [180].

Civil Service Appointments.—On motion for a Committee, the Chancellor of Exchequer makes an interesting statement as to the result of competitive examination, [181]. *The Purchase System in the Army.*—Sir De L. Evans moves for a select committee to inquire into this subject, [182]; and is seconded by Lord Goderich, [183]; after interesting debate by Mr. Peel, Lord Stanley, Mr. S. Herbert, Lord Palmerston promises inquiry by commission; motion withdrawn, [185]; Mr. S. Herbert's motion respecting military education, [185]; remarks of Lord Palmerston, [187].

Affairs of India.—The Earl of Albemarle brings forward a statement respecting torture in India, [188]; answer of the Duke of Argyle, [190]; remarks of Lord Ellenborough, [191]; Sir E. Perry draws attention to the increasing deficit of the Indian revenue, [191]; reply of Mr. V. Smith, [192]; Sir J. Hogg, [193]; Annual Statement of the East India revenue accounts, [193]; general discussion on Indian affairs, [195].

Mr. Disraeli reviews the Session in a sarcastic speech, [197]; Lord Palmerston's reply on behalf of the Ministers, [205]; Parliament prorogued by commission; the speech of the Lords' Commissioners, [206].

PATENTS, List of, 540.

PEACE, The. [*See* WAR WITH RUSSIA; TREATY OF PEACE.]

PERSIA.—War between England and Persia on account of the occupation of Herat, [251]; insults offered to the British Minister by the Court of Teheran, [252]; war proclaimed, [253]; the British expedition arrives in the Persian Gulf and captures Bushire, [254].

POETRY, 558.

INDEX.

PROMOTIONS.—Civil Service Appointments, Promotions, &c., 290 ; army promotions and appointments, 296 ; navy promotions and appointments, 304 ; ecclesiastical preferments and appointments, 307 ; collegiate and scholastic appointments, 308.

PRUSSIA.—Quarrel with Switzerland on the affair of Neuchâtel : the King of Prussia resolves to protect the insurgents, [244] ; history of the Principalities, [244] ; negotiation and intervention of France and England, [245] ; firmness of the Swiss Confederation, and hostile attitude of the King : hostilities imminent, [247].

Strange and fatal duel at Berlin, death of Herr von Hinckeldy, 58.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.—Order of Victoria : Copy of the Royal Warrant laying down the Regulations under which the Decoration of the Victoria Cross is to be conferred, 344 ; return of the officers and men killed in the Crimea up to the 1st June, 1856, 348 ; do. of all the casualties, 349 ; Table of Statutes 19° & 20° Vict. 349. [*See STATE PAPERS.*]

QUEEN, THE. Her Majesty's Speech on opening the Session, [2] ; confirmation of the Princess Royal, 63 ; visit of Her Majesty to the military hospitals at Chatham, 95 ; to Aldershot camp, 97 ; great naval review at Spithead, 97.

Racing Meetings — Epsom, 114 ; Ascot, 123 ; Goodwood ; terrible accident, 145.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.—Mr. Lewis Morgan killed on the Merthyr Tydvil railway, 159 ; collision on the Greenwich line, 173 ; on the Eastern Counties line, 182 ; on the Newport and Hereford line, 183 ; on the Waterford and Kilkenny line, 7 persons killed, 187 ; return of accidents on railways in 1856, 204 ; frightful accident on the North Pennsylvania line, U.S., 100 persons killed, 139.

Review—Great naval review at Spithead, 97.

Royal Academy, Exhibition of the, 111.

Rugeley Poisonings, The.—*Padwick v. Sarah Palmer* ; forgeries of William Palmer, the poisoner, 13 ; conviction of the Rugeley postmaster, 60 ; trial of William Palmer for the murder of John Parsons Cook, at the Central Criminal Court, 387.

RUSSIA.—After the capture of Sebastopol, the Russian government is disposed to

RUSSIA—*continued.*

peace, [209] ; and issues proposals in anticipation of Austrian intervention, but accepts the Austrian basis of negotiation, [211] ; the Plenipotentiaries meet at Paris, [212] ; articles of the Treaty, [213] ; conventions respecting the Dardanelles and the Aland Islands, and the armaments in the Black Sea, [216, 217] ; subsequent proceedings of the Congress, [217] ; conclusion of the war in the Crimea ; re-embarkation of the allied armies ; manifesto of the Emperor, [222] ; coronation of the Emperor at Moscow, [223] ; great relaxation of taxation and conscription granted to the devastated provinces, [224] ; difficulties in the execution of the Treaty ; Serpents' Island and the Bessarabian frontier ; a new Conference at Paris necessary, [225].

Reception of the news of peace in London, effect on the funds, 10 ; armistice signed, 17 ; signature of the Treaty of Paris, 70 ; proclamation of the Peace, 100 ; celebration of the Peace ; grand display of fireworks and illuminations, 115.

SARDINIA.—Address or protest of the Sardinian plenipotentiaries to the Congress of Paris respecting the affairs of Italy, [230] ; Count Cavour details to the Sardinian Chambers his efforts at the Congress, [232].

SHERIFFS for the year 1856, 206.

SHIPWRECKS AND DISASTERS AT SEA.—

Wreck of H. M. steam-sloop *Polyphemus*, 15 ; of the French packet-ship *St. Denis*, with great loss of life, 16 ; fearful collision and wreck of the *Josephine Willis*, 69 lives lost, 21 ; total loss of the American mail steam-ship *Pacific*, and all on board, 66 ; dreadful sufferings of the crew of the *John Routledge*, 102 ; wreck of a Chilean war-steamer, 300 lives lost, 102 ; dreadful sufferings of the crew of the *Blake*, 104 ; steam explosion of the *Nimrod* at Cork, six men scalded to death, 114 ; wreck of the *Pallas*, 82 lives lost, 114 ; fatal collision in the Mersey, 132 ; wreck of the *Western Bride*, 158 ; the *Niagara* burnt on Lake Michigan, 60 lives lost, 158 ; fatal explosion of a collier at Cardiff, 172 ; destruction of *Le Lyonnais*, many lives lost, 179 ; explosion on board the mail-steamer *Parana*, several persons scalded to death, 188 ; return of wrecks in 1856, 203.

SPAIN—Ministerial revolution ; Espartero

I N D E X.

SPAIN—*continued.*

dismissed, and O'Donnell becomes Minister; address to the Queen, [238]; decree of the new Government virtually overturning the constitution, [239]; the Cortes assemble in haste, pass a vote of disapproval, and are dissolved, [240]; singular approbation of O'Donnell's proceedings by the French Government, [240]; a movement in the provinces suppressed, [241]; royal decree dissolving the National Guard, [243]; O'Donnell supplanted by Narvaez, 244.

STATE PAPERS. TREATIES. I.—i. International. General Treaty of Paris, 310; Additional Article, 318; Conventions annexed thereto, 318; Declaration respecting Maritime Law, 321; Treaty guaranteeing the Independence of the Ottoman Empire, 322; Treaty securing the Integrity of Sweden, 323; Treaty between Her Majesty and the Swiss Confederation, 324; Treaty between Her Majesty and the Republic of Chile, 328; Convention between Her Majesty and the Emperor of Japan, 334.

II. Foreign.—i. Firman of the Sultan relative to the Privileges and Reforms in Turkey, 337. ii. Protocol of Warsaw relative to the Danish Succession, 341.

III. Domestic. [*See PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.*]

STATUTES, Table of, 19 & 20 Vict. i. Public General Acts, 349; ii. Local and Personal Acts, declared Public, and to be judicially noticed, 353; iii. Private Acts, *printed*, 359; Private Acts, *not printed*, 360.

STOCKS, Prices of, highest and lowest, 361.

SWITZERLAND.—The affair of Neuchâtel. A party of royalists seize the castle, on behalf of the King of Prussia; the insurrection suppressed, [244]; the King of Prussia resolves to support the insurgents—history of the Principality, [244]; negotiations, and intervention of France and England, [245]; firmness of the Swiss Confederation, and hostile attitude of the King of Prussia, [247].

TREATY OF PEACE—*continued.*

Italy, Naples, and the license of the press, [217]; the Earl of Clarendon expresses the views of the English Government on these subjects, [218]; important declaration respecting international maritime law signed by the Plenipotentiaries, [221]; difficulties in the execution of the treaty, Serpents' Island, and the Bessarabian frontier; a further conference necessary, [225].

Reception of the news of peace in London, effect on the funds, 10; armistice signed, 17; signature of the treaty of Paris, 70; proclamation of the peace, 100; celebration of the peace, grand display of fireworks and illuminations, 115.

TRIALS AND LAW CASES.—*Civil*: Padwick *v.* Sarah Palmer; forgeries of William Palmer, the poisoner, 13.

Criminal: Of Edward Harvey and Harriet Ray, for starving a child to death, 2; of Mary MacNeill, for murdering her two children, 3; of Sarah Allan, for the murder of her two children, 4; of C. B. Westron, for the murder of Mr. Waugh, 9, 23; of William Bousfield, for the murder of his wife and three children in Soho, 18; of James Couroy and others, for the murder of Dorothy Bewicke (the Matfen murder), 42; of the Chelmsford poachers, murder of William Hales, 43; of John Fowkes, for the murder of John Acres Fowkes (the Snarestone murder), 53; of Thomas Jones, for the murder of Mr. Hope, 56; of Samuel Cheshire, the Rugeley postmaster, 60; of Mary Weeks, for the murder of her child, 64; of Hans Hansen, for the murder of Charles Jacobi, 66; of Emma Mussett, for the murder of her child, 68; of J. Carr, and P. Wall, for the murder of James House, at Liverppol, 74; of George Rogers and others, for burglary at Keynsham, 75; of James Murphy and Thomas Dunne for the murder of Miss Hind, 82; of E. A. Harris, for the murder of her two children, (the Uxbridge murders), 84; of Celestina Sommer, for the murder of her child (the Islington murder), 87; of John Markham, for forgery, erroneous conviction, 118; of William Lewis, a desperate pirate, 125; double murder at Melton Mowbray, 129; of Edward Towers and others, for a daring burglary at Stamford Hill, 134; of Samuel Barrett and others, for starving a child to death, 136; of John Murdock, for the

TREATY OF PEACE.—Austria proposes bases of negotiation, which are agreed to by Russia, [210]; the Plenipotentiaries meet at Paris—articles of the treaty of peace, [213]; conventions respecting the Dardanelles, the Aland Islands, naval armaments in the Black Sea, [217]; Count Walewski brings before the Congress the subjects of Greece,

INDEX.

TRIALS, &c.—*continued.*

murder of James Welland in Hastings Gaol, 140; of Elizabeth Brown, for the murder of her husband, 141; of John Cain and Richard Rayne, for the murder of Mr. Stirling (the Bur-nopfield murder), 142; of Ann Matthews and others, for the murder of her infant, 146; of Dedea Redanies, for the murder of two girls at Folkestone, 149; combinations amongst workmen, important trial, 161; of Octavius King, a corn-merchant, for forgery, 169; of Hardwieke and Salt, for forgery, the great gang of forgers, 174; of W. J. Robson, for extensive forgeries on the Crystal Palace Company, 176; of Robert Marley, for the murder of Richard Cope in Parliament-street, 189; trial of three Italian seamen for murder and piracy, 192; of William Jackson, for the murder of his two children, at Chester, 197; of John Hannah, for the murder of Jane Banham (the Armley murder), 198; of Thomas Mansell, for the murder of his sergeant, at Dover, 200.

Trial of William Palmer for the murder of John Parsons Cook, (the Rugeley poisonings) at the Central Criminal Court, 387; the Leeds poisoning case—trial of William Dove for the murder of his wife, 529.

UNITED STATES—Disputes between the United States and England respecting Central America; the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, [263]; protectorate of the Mosquito Territory; case of Grey Town, [264]; nature of the questions in dispute, [264]; these disputes settled by a convention, [269]; the great slavery question; differences between the northern and southern States; the Kansas territory, [271]; differences between the Senate and the House of Representatives on this question, [272]; the Representatives yield the victory to the pro-slavery party, [273]; great excitement on the election of a new President, [273]; views attached to the several candidates; Mr. Buchanan's address, [274]; he obtains the majority in the Electoral College, [276]; new disputes with England on the recruiting question, the British Minister and Consuls dismissed, [277]; the President's annual message, [278]; question of slavery,

UNITED STATES—*continued.*

[278]; Kansas, [281]; Customs, [283]; Army and Navy, [284]; relation with foreign powers, [284]; resolutions of the Paris Conference with reference to maritime law, [221–235]; Nicaragua, [287]; Isthmus of Panama, [287]; conclusion, [288].

Frightful accident on the North Pennsylvania Railway, 100 persons killed, 139; steamer burnt on Lake Michigan, 60 lives lost, 158.

UNIVERSITY HONOURS. — Oxford, 381; Cambridge, 384.

WAR WITH RUSSIA.—The Russian government disposed to peace; threatening attitude of Austria; neutral policy of Prussia, [209]; mission of Count Esterhazy to St. Petersburg with proposals for a peace; despatch of Count Buol with proposals for basis of negotiation, [210]; Russian proposals issued in anticipation, [211]; Russia accepts the Austrian bases; the Plenipotentiaries meet at Paris, [212]; an armistice agreed to; articles of the Treaty of Paris, [213]; Convention respecting the Dardanelles and Bosphorus, [216]; Convention respecting naval armaments in the Black Sea and the Aland Islands, [217]; Count Walewski brings several subjects before the Congress; Greece, Italy, Naples; the newspaper press, especially of Belgium, [217]; the Earl of Clarendon expresses the views of England on these subjects, [218]; views of Count Orloff and M. Buol, [218]; excitement caused in Belgium by the allusion to the press; reply of M. Vilain XIV. in the Belgian Chambers, [220]; the Congress discuss the question of international maritime law; a solemn declaration signed, [221]; this declaration not acceptable to the United States, [221].

Conclusion of the war in the Crimea; armistice and final embarkation of the allied armies, [222]; manifesto of the Emperor of Russia, [222.]

Difficulties arise in the execution of the Treaty; Serpents' Island and the Bessarabian frontier, [225].

WEATHER, THE—in January, 1; destructive storm in February, 30; the weather in September, 165; dense fog in London, 173; the weather in December, 202.

